15.1.9.41 Anal.

A

DISCOURSE

OF

Superstition:

WHEREIN

The Church of *ENGLAND* is Vindicated from the Imputation.

To which is added

A

PEACEABLE

PLEA

FOR

UNION and *PEACE*,

In an Expostulatory Address both to the Conformist and Non-Conformist.

By *Will. Shelton*, Rector of St *James Colchester*.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. M.* for *J. Robinson* at the *Golden Lyon* in St *Paul's Church-Yard*, 1681.

19½.9919

C134.266.30*

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

To the

RIGHT REVEREND

FATHER in GOD,

AND

RIGHT HONOURABLE

HENRY

LORD BISHOP

OF

LONDON,

One of His Majesties most Honourable Privy-Council, &c.

May it please your Lordship,

THere is none to whom I owe account of my self and Studies, more than to

your *Lordſhip* as my *Dioceſan.* None to whom I more readily ſubmit this Eſſay, which endeavours to do Right to the *Church of England*, whoſe Honour and Security is ſo great a part of your *Lordſhips* care, as to challenge the acknowledgment of all Pens. The Moderation of our *Church* (which ought to be eſteem'd her Glory) in receding no farther from the *Church of Rome*, than ſhe has receded from Primitive Chriſtianity, is objected as a Crime, by the eager men of the *ſeparation.*

Our Firſt Reformers were Wiſe

Wiſe men, and (Thanks be to God) ſo are their Succeſſors too. Their Wiſdom in the firſt compiling, and late Review of our *Liturgy*, has directed them to keep *the mean between the Two Extreams, of too much ſtiffneſs in refuſing, and too much eaſineſs in admitting variations.* So by the good Providence of God, have we been deliver'd from the *ſuperſtitions* of the *Romiſh Church*; and ſo have we been preſerved from a *ſuperſtitious* avoiding *ſuperſtition.*

As the Kingdom of *England* is famous for being the Balance of *Europe*; ſo is the

Church of England, for being, by a regular Reformation, well fix'd in a due distance between the *superstitious* additions of the *Church of Rome*, where *Supremacy*, *Infallibility*, and the *Inquisition* compel men to *swallow Camels*, and the *superstitious Abstinences* of those who *strain at Gnats*, and either will not Understand the notion of a thing *Indifferent*, or will not rightly infer from it.

To evince this, is the Design of the following Tract, which in all humility I offer to your *Lordships* Patronage, being thereto emboldened, by

by the Experience I have had of your *Lordſhips* Candor and Favour, which by how much the leſs I have merited, I ought the more to acknowledge.

God Almighty preſerve your *Lordſhip* to a long *Preſidency* in this *Church*: and bleſs the joint labours and cares of the Right Reverend my *Lords the Biſhops*, to ſuch an happy Repair of our Breaches; that neither the *Wild-Boar*, nor the *Foxes*, may ſpoil our Vineyard: to be ſuch a defence upon the *Glory of this Church*, that neither

neither the *Romaniſt* nor *Separatiſt*, may ſtain or darken it. So prayeth,

Your Lordſhips

in all Humility

and Obedience,

W. SHELTON.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

THE Occaſion of this Diſcourſe. The Church of England *charg'd with* Superſtition. *In the times of Queen* Elizabeth, *King* James. *The reproach reſtrain'd by a Canon, to no purpoſe. The Jealouſy encreas'd in the beginning of* Charles I. *and in the time of the Covenant. The deſign of this Diſcourſe.* Pag. 1

SECT. II.

The uſe of the word firſt inquir'd into: Then the nature of the thing. How Greek Authours uſe Δεισιδαιμονία.

Smith's

Smith's *ſelect Diſcourſe.* Plutarch. Max. Tyrius. Antoninus. Dr Hammond's *Tract of* Superſtition *conſider'd. What Latin Authors mean by* Superſtitio. Tully *oppoſes it to* Religion. Lactantius *not agreeing with him in the reaſon of the word.* p. 11

SECT. III.

Other Etymologies. Superſtitio quaſi ſuper ſtatutum. Lucretius *huffs at all Religion as* ſuper ſtans. Nigidius Figulus *account of the word.* Seneca, Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny *take it in a bad ſenſe, ſo* Feſtus *and* St. Paul. St Auſtin *differs not, who comprehends many particulars under this General, according to whom many* ſuperſtitious *obſervations obtain ſtill in the World. Three Definitions of* ſuperſtition *out of* Aquinas. Zanchy, Ames *to the ſame purpoſe.* Religion, *True Worſhip;* Superſtition *falſe worſhip.* p. 18

SECT.

SECT. IV.

The Nature of the thing conſider'd in ſeveral Propoſitions. First, Superſtition is firſt in the Opinion, then in the practice. *To which agree* Morton, Hooker, Falkener. *The ſame practice ſuperſtitious or not, as the Opinion is by which it is guided. This the Foundation of what follows.* p. 28

SECT. V.

Second Propoſ. The Doctrines upon which the Conformity of the *Church of England* is eſtabliſhed, are not ſuperſtitious Opinions. *Thoſe Doctrines are as follows. First,* All Circumſtances relating to the worſhip of God, are not particularly determin'd in H. Scripture. T. C. *gainſays, but it is manifeſtly true. Our Adverſaries acknowledge and build upon it.* p. 34

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Secondly, Some things (notwithſtanding Scripture determinations) do ſtill remain Indifferent in their nature. *This denied by* Bradſhaw *and* Brook: Bradſhaw *chang'd his mind, but his followers propagate his firſt Opinion. A groſs miſtake. A Thing* Indifferent *not a mean between* Good *and* evil, *but between* Commanded *and* forbidden. p. 40

SECT. VII.

Brooks *notion*, Optimum eſt eligendum, *not always true. In divers caſes no* Beſt. *Many diſhes at a feaſt. Many Inns in a Town. Many Shops in a City. He that ſtays till he know which is Beſt, will in many caſes never determine, becauſe he hath nothing to determine him but his own choice. The Ceremo-*

The Contents.

Ceremonies of our Religion not altogether so Indifferent, *but* in specie *neither Commanded nor forbidden.* p. 45

SECT. VIII.

Thirdly, The Church may make Determinations in things Indifferent. *Scrupled by* Brooke, *whose Discourse of* Episcopacy *is again examin'd. The weakness and Unworthiness of it detected. Denied also by others,* Modest Discourse, *&c. and* Bagshaw, *but upon insufficient grounds.* p. 55

SECT. IX.

This acknowledged by the Presbyterians *in their* Directory, Confession of Faith. *Other Authors that have written since. Acknowledged also by the* Independents *in their Confession of Faith,* 1658. p. 66

SECT.

SECT. X.

Fourthly, Where the Governours of the Church have power to determine, they ought to be obey'd. Zanchy *and* Calvin *on our ſide. When* Zanchy *would not have theſe things impos'd, yet he would have them yielded to (if impos'd) rather than any man ſhould quit his Miniſtry.* p. 71

SECT. XI.

Calvin *of the ſame mind. Much for a ſtated Liturgy and Ceremonies, which though he would have few, yet thoſe he finds fault with, do not now obtain in our* Church. *What he did not like, he would have born with. As the* Surplice *in Biſhop* Hoopers *caſe, and Unleaven'd Bread at* Geneva. p. 80

SECT.

SECT. XII.

Beſides theſe M. Durell *cites about* 40. *Foreigners all of the ſame Judgment. As were alſo our Countreymen,* T.C. Humfrey Rainolds, Knewſtubs, *others. And of late* Mr Baxter. *Theſe Teſtimonies concluded with* St. Ambroſe, *and* St. Auſtin's *determination.* p. 87

SECT. XIII.

Fifthly, It is lawful for the Church to appoint ſignificant Ceremonies. *This denied by N. Cts. How they differ from Sacraments. The Presbyterians require* ſitting *at the Lords Supper becauſe* ſignificant. *Their pretence of the Example of Chriſt not ſufficient. Becauſe,* p. 93

SECT. XIV.

First, That Example does no more oblige in this, than in other Circumstances of Time and place, unless in the significancy *of it, which then is as much* superstitious *as our kneeling. For secondly, They have not Example for the same manner of sitting. Thirdly, Not certain whether they have Example for any manner of sitting at all.* p. 100

SECT. XV.

They use another significant *Ceremony in the Covenant and consent they require of people whereby they should own their Minister.* Worcestershire *Agreement gives account of it. Distinction between Discipline and Worship will not help them.* p. 108

SECT.

SECT. XVI.

Upon these Grounds the Church of England *not* superstitious, *unless the number of Ceremonies be too great. Which hath been complain'd of without Cause, and some of them acknowledge in our favour. A Digression about the number of Ceremonies. Or unless our Rites be requir'd as somewhat more than* Indifferent. *In which the Prefaces to our Liturgy vindicate us.* p. 112

SECT. XVII.

Two Objections. 1. *Ceremonies impos'd as* Indifferent *are not so. So they were once believ'd. But now some* N. C^ts. *think not so of them. Answer. Where no Law, no Transgression. Not forbid in the second Command, nor elsewhere. The Surplice, and Kneeling, and the Cross particularly consider'd.* p. 127

SECT. XVIII.

2 *Obj.* *Though in Nature Indifferent, yet ſome Accidents may render it ſinful to impoſe or practiſe them.* *They are thought by* Bagſhaw *to be laid as ſnares for tender Conſciences.* *If ſo, it would be Tyranny rather than ſuperſtition.* *But it blaſphemes Dignities ſo to think.* *The Accidents conſider'd: Becauſe they are offenſive: becauſe they come from* Papiſts. *The law of not giving offence does not diſoblige the ſubject from obedience in things in themſelves lawful.* *Nor does it diſable the Magiſtrate from making laws in things* Indifferent. *The abuſe of* Popery *ſignified nothing to* T. C. *in his own caſe.* *The ſecond General Propoſition concluded.* p. 132

SECT.

SECT. XIX.

Third Proposition. The Opinions that are superstitious are rejected by the Church of England. *Divers Objections against* Popery *besides* superstition, *but that now to be consider'd. They are* superstitious. *First, in making their Ceremonies necessary parts of Gods worship.* Pius IV. *Creed impos'd upon all Bishops, makes all the Doctrines of* Trent *necessary to salvation. They equal Traditions to the written word, and so introduce false Doctrines. They teach for Doctrines the Commands of men, and so are* superstitious. p. 144

SECT. XX.

Secondly, They ascribe an efficacious sanctity to their Ceremonies. They worship the Cross with Latra, *and affirm that*

it ſcares away the Devil, drives away diſeaſes, and ſanctifies the things on which it is made. This is ſuperſtition *to expect effects as by divine Inſtitution, which we have no warrant to expect.* Eſtius *endeavours to ſalve the matter, but not to ſatisfaction. They teach that the Sacraments confer Grace* Ex opere Operato, *and that is* ſuperſtitious. Bellarmines *diſtinction between* opus operatum, *and* operantis, *to their prejudice.* p. 154

SECT. XXI.

Thirdly, Their Doctrine of Merit *is* ſuperſtitious. Bellarmine *aſcribes Merit and ſatisfaction to good Works. His famous acknowledgment to the contrary. We own a neceſſity of good works, but exclude Merit. Whatever elſe is any where done upon a Religious account, farther than Religion ought to be concern'd, is* ſuperſtitious. *The*

Church

Church of England *not guilty in any of these Cases.* p. 163

SECT. XXII.

The Fourth Proposition. There are superstitious Omissions of which men may be guilty, when they seem greatly to abhor superstition. *A Negative* Superstition. A superstitious fearfulness of which *Lord* Bacon *and St.* Austin *complain. Such was that of the* Jews *who would not defend themselves on the Sabbath day. Of the Souldiers in* Sfetigrade. *The N. Cts. have reason to examine whether their* Abstinence *be not such. To abstain from that which is lawful, as believing it Unlawful, this undue opinion of Religious Matters is* superstitious. *The Conclusion.* p. 171

ER-

ERRATA.

PAge 95. *line* 9. *for* where insignificant, *read* wherein significant, *p.* 149. *l.* 13. *for* rest *r.* rests; the lesser faults are left to the ingenuity of the Reader to correct or pardon.

THere is lately published the seventh Edition of a Body of Divinity, *&c.* By the most Reverend Father in God, *James Usher*, late Arch-Bishop of *Armagh*, to which is added his Life, containing many remarkable passages never before Extant. Sold by *Jonathan Robinson*, at the Golden-Lyon in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*.

A DISCOURSE OF Superstition

With respect to the

PRESENT TIMES, &c.

THE prejudices and disaffections which have alienated so many from the Communion of the *Church of England*, owe themselves to no Original more, than to an Opinion taken up, that some Usages in our Church are *Superstitious*; An Opinion strongly concluded, but upon weak grounds, and by a Process very illogical. For when the Sect. 1.

Adversaries of our Order and Peace, have amply represented, how jealous God is of his Honour, how severely he hath threatned the breaches of the second Commandment, and how sorely he hath punished the Idolatry of the Jews; in the application of these things to our Times, *Superstition* and *Idolatry* are frequently join'd, as equally forbidden in that Commandment, and without more proof the *Church of England* is supposed guilty of *Superstition*, and good people are exhorted to come out of her, upon pain of partaking of those Plagues which Idolaters have reason to fear.

From the times of Queen *Elizabeth* down to our days, *Superstition* hath been laid to our Charge. Mr *Hooker* acknowledges and resents it. *So it is judged our Prayers, our Sacraments, our Fasts, our times and places of publick meeting together for the Worship and*

Ecclesiastic. Pol. Book 5. §. 4.

and Service of God, our Marriages, our Burials, our Functions, Elections, and Ordinations Eccleſiaſtical, almoſt whatſoever we do in the exerciſe of our Religion, according to Laws for that purpoſe eſtabliſhed, all things are ſome way or other thought faulty, all things ſtained with Superſtition.

One of the *Treatiſes* that were ſent abroad (as it were to give new light to a new World) 1660. under the name of Mr *William Bradſhaw*, is about things *Indifferent*, where he thus ſpeaks in the Marginal Notes. *The Doctors of* Oxford *ask, what hurt can a wiſe Man ſee in a ſquare Cap and a Surplice? Indeed there is no outward hurt or evil in it, but it muſt be conſidered, whether there be not any inward hurt therein; for if it can be proved, that by them the Souls of many are poiſoned with* ſuperſtitious *conceits, then it is apparent that they have inward hurt in them.* This is but a ſuppoſition, but it fol-

Notes on the fifth Chapt. of things Indifferent.

Ibid. *Notes on Chap.* 8. lows dogmatically, *The Ceremonies in Controversy have been and are, the special means and occasion of the Schism of many Hundred Brownists, of much* Superstition *in many Thousand Ignorant Protestants, and of Confirmation of many Infinites of wilful Papists in their Idolatry.* He concludes the Treatise thus: *The Ceremonies in Controversy are either excellent parts of our Religion* (which he not yielding must believe the other part of the Disjunction) *or notorious parts of Superstition.*

This is the dirt that was cast upon the *Church of England*, in the beginning of King *James* his Reign, that he might be out of love with her. A reproach of which the *Convocation* of 1603. was so sensible (for though that Treatise came first out, a little after the Convocation, yet the suspicion was rife before) that they pass this Canon among others: *Whosoever shall hereafter af-*

Canon 6.

firm,

firm, the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, *by Law eſtabliſhed, are wicked, Antichriſtian or* Superſtitious, *&c. Let him be Excommunicated*, &c. This Canon did not reſtrain the petulancy of Cenſorious men, for beſides Mr. *Bradſhaws* confidence; in the defence that Dr *Burges* makes for Biſhop *Morton*, it appears, that the N. Csts of thoſe times did thus argue. *The Ceremonies of the* Church of England *have been and ſtill are abuſed to Idolatry and* Superſtition *by the Papiſts.* And *that we cannot be thought ſincerely to have repented of that Idolatry and Superſtition, except we caſt away with deteſtation all the Inſtruments of it.* Once more, they ſay, *That a ſuperſtitious conſtruction is made of our Croſs, not only by the Papiſts, but by our own Canons and Canonical Impoſers of it.*

Burges *Anſwer Rejoined* Chap. 4. §. 1.

Id. ib. §. 4.

Id. ib. §. 79.

Theſe Jealouſies did but fly in the dark during King *James* his

Reign, but soon after *Charles* the *First* came to the Throne, he received divers Complaints of this nature: The *Parliament*, *Anno* 1628. complains of Idolatry and *Superstition* as some of those *heinous and crying sins, which were the undoubted Cause of those evils that were fallen upon them.* The *Remonstrance* which the Commons of the same *Parliament* made against the then *Duke* of *Buckingham*, expresses their fears concerning *Innovation of Religion.* A while after Mr. *Rouse* makes a Speech concerning Religion, wherein he desires it may be considered, *what new paintings are laid on the old face of the Whore of Babylon.* How the *See of* Rome *does eat into our Religion, and fret into the banks and walls of it*: for a remedy of which, he propounds the expedient of a *Covenant, to hold fast God and Religion, to which Covenant he would have every man say* Amen. This man does not

Rushworth *Historical Collections*, p. 526.

Id. ib. p. 621.

Ib. p. 645, 646.

(it

(it is true) ſpeak of *Superſtition*, but he is underſtood to mean it, by another Orator of the ſame Houſe (Mr. *Pym*) who complains *that the Law was violated in bringing in* ſuperſtitious *Ceremonies*. After whom, another in the ſame Seſſion (Sir *John Eliott*) apprehends a fear of ſome Biſhops then in place, that if they ſhould be in their power, they might be in danger of having Religion overthrown, becauſe *ſome of them were Maſters of Ceremonies, and laboured to introduce new Ceremonies into the Church.* Ib. p. 647. Ib. p. 649.

After thoſe eager Debates, the motion for a *Covenant* ſlept for ſome years, but was renewed again in the Unhappy Times of the *Fatal Parliament*. In the times when it was a great part of the Impeachment againſt the Great *Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury*, that he had *traiterouſly endeavoured to alter and ſubvert Gods true Religion by law eſtabliſhed in this* Artic. of Impeach. 7. 10.

Realm, and instead thereof to set up Popish superstition *and Idolatry*, and that he *traiterously endeavoured to reconcile the* Church of England *with the* Church of Rome. In these times it was that Mr. *Rouse*'s motion ripen'd up to a *Solemn League and Covenant*, wherein they obliged themselves to endeavour the Extirpation of *Popery*, *Prelacy*, and *Superstition*. By which words the *Covenanters* (as some of them have since declar'd) believe themselves obliged against Conformity; for, this reason they give in a Book they call *a Sober and Temperate Discourse concerning the Interest of words in Prayer*, &c. in which the Title of one of their Chapters

Chap. 10. is: *The Ministers Third Reason*, viz. *why they do not meddle with the Common Prayer* (as are the words of the Chapter) *is, because they have sworn to endeavour a reformation in worship, and to endeavour to extirpate Superstition.*

Nothing

Nothing now can be more evident, than that both of old, and in our times *Superſtition* is objected to us. It does not come in my way to condemn, nor do I take upon me to juſtify the practiſes of all particular perſons; I concern my ſelf only in the legal Eſtabliſhments of our Church, and they would little need a vindication, if men would take the pains to enquire into the nature of *Superſtition*; for they would ſoon find the Innocence of our Rites would defend themſelves from this ſuſpicion. But it is our Unhappineſs that we have to deal with men who take things upon truſt, who are not eaſily undeceived, becauſe they will maintain a Concluſion, before they have examined the premiſes: obſerving *Superſtition* to be a word that ſignifies ſomewhat bad, they condemn us without a Tryal, and before they know what it means, conclude

conclude us guilty of *Superstition.*

I have waited some while in expectation, that some abler Pen would engage in this Argument, but not finding that of late days, the Nature of *Superstition* has been particularly and fully discovered or described, I have now undertaken the task, in which because I desire to be understood, I labour for no other ornament of stile than perspicuity: And without farther Preface I proceed to enquire, what is this *Superstition* with which the *Church of England* is so much upbraided.

There is no Precept in the Holy Scripture that forbids *Superstition* by that name, nor does any sacred Author mention it, except St. *Luke* in two places to be considered in due time, when I examine how the word is used in other Authors; For by this Method, I conceive, I shall best accomplish my design, if

First,

First, I enquire into the use of the Word. And secondly, into the nature of the thing signified by such a Word.

1. Δεισιδαιμονία (by which the Greeks expres'd that which we now commonly call *Superstition*) signifies most literally a service perform'd to God or to a Dæmon, rather out of fear than love; *An over-timerous and dreadful apprehension of the Deity*, as the learned *Smith*, who also calls it a *compound of Fear and Flattery*; such an *apprehension of God in the thoughts of men, as renders him grievous and burdensome to them.* But however this may be the primary sense of the word, yet that it hath been transfer'd to signifie more largely, is evident from Greek Authors. *Plutarch* in his Tract, Περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, constantly discourses of it, as of an extream to Religion, to which he opposes Atheism as the other extream; Thus he

Sect. 2.

Select Discourse of Superstit. p. 26. & 36.

he begins, Τῆς περὶ θεῶν ἀμαθίας καὶ ἀγνοίας ἐξ ἀρχῆς δίχα ῥυείσης τὸ μὲν τ ἀθεότητα, τὸ δὲ τ δεισιδαιμονίαν ἐμπεποίηκεν. *Ignorance of God from the beginning hath run in Two Channels, one way to Atheism, and the other way to Superstition.* And after he had in many like expressions, opposed them to one another he concludes, Ἔνιοι φεύγοντες τ δεισιδαιμονίαν ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς ἀθεότητα, ὑπερπηδήσαντες ἐν μέσῳ κειμένην τ εὐσέβειαν. *Some have run so far from* Superstition, *till they have overshot themselves into* Atheism, *having neglected* Religion *which is the mean between both.*

Dissertat. 4ta. *Maximus Tyrius* as plainly opposes the *Religious*, and *Superstitious* man. Ὁ μὲν εὐσεβὴς φίλος θεῷ, ὁ δὲ δεισιδαίμων κόλαξ θεοῦ, &c. *A Religious man is the Friend of God, A superstitious man is a Flatterer of God.*

Lib. 6. §. 30. *Antoninus* gives this Character of himself, He was Θεοσεβὴς χωρὶς δεισιδαιμονίας, *Religious without Superstition.*

The

The Incomparable Dr *Hammond* does (I know) purſue the Etymology and Original Notion of δεισιδαιμονία, in the former part of his little Tract of *Superſtition*; where he gives ſeveral Interpretations of Δαίμονες, and afterwards gives theſe ſenſes of the Compound word.

1. *It is taken in general for Religion or Worſhipping God.*

2. *For the worſhip of deify'd dead men, and Angels which the Heathens took to be True Gods.*

3. *For any part of Divine Worſhip which for fear of vengeance from God, any Worſhipper perform'd to him.*

4. *For a trembling fear of Gods puniſhment due for every ſin.*

5. *For the uſe of Magical Spells.* From whence he concludes the Modern uſe of the word improper; but whether proper or improper, becauſe it is uſe that gives the rule for our manner of ſpeaking, therefore that

muſt

muſt be conſidered: And that the word is uſed for ſomewhat undue in the worſhip of God, he himſelf acknowledges in theſe words. *That which men ſee thoſe of another perſwaſion do, which they like not, or think them not bound to, they call it ſtraight their Superſtition.*

And that thus Authors have made uſe of this word, will more appear by conſidering the Latin word, *Superſtitio.* Concerning whoſe Etymology all Criticks are not agreed. *Tully* diſcourſes at large both of the name and thing, and he is the firſt among the Latin Authors now extant, for ſo far as I can find, that ſo tranſlates the Greek Word: for if *Nigidius Figulus* (of whom by and by out of *A. Gellius*) were before him, yet I ſuppoſe he hath no entire Volume now extant. I therefore take ſome particular notice of what *Tully* ſays in this Matter. When he had

given

given some natural Account of the Multitude of Gods that were so much talkt of in those Ages, and of the *Superstitions* that took rise from the Fables of the Poets concerning them, he proceeds to distinguish between *Religion and Superstition*, in memorable words. *Cultus Deorum est Optimus idemq; castissimus atq; sanctissimus, plenissimusq; pietatis, ut eos semper purâ integrâ incorruptâ & mente & voce veneremur. Non enim philosophi solum, verum etiam Majores nostri* Superstitionem *à* Religione *separaverunt. Nam qui totos dies precabantur & immolabant, ut sui liberi sibi superstites essent,* Superstitiosi *sunt appellati, quod nomen patuit postea latius. Qui autem omnia quæ ad Deorum cultum pertinerent, diligenter pertractarent & tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti* Religiosi, *&c. Ita factum est in* Superstitioso & Religioso, *alterum vitii Nomen, alterum laudis. The best, and purest, and most holy worship that we can*

Cicero de Naturâ Deorum lib. 2.

can give to God, is to serve him with a pure and uncorrupt heart and voice. For it was not only peculiar to Philosophers, but our Forefathers also made a difference between Religion *and* Superstition, *for they who prayed all day long and offer'd Sacrifice that their Children might survive them, were called* Superstitious; *A word which afterwards was extended to a larger signification: But* Religious *men had their name from their diligence and care in reviewing what pertained to Divine Worship. And hence it came to pass, that in the setled use of these words,* Superstition *was counted a Crime,* Religion *a praise-worthy thing.* According to which distinction he had said before: *Superstitione facile est liberare, cum sustuleris omnem vim Deorum: nisi forte* Diagoram *aut* Theodorum *qui omnino Deos esse negabant, censes* Superstitiosos *esse potuisse. Horum enim sententiæ non modo* Superstitionem *tollunt in qua inest Timor inanis Deorum, sed etiam*

Id. ibid. lib. 1.

etiam Religionem *quæ Deorum cultu pio continetur. It is an eaſy matter to ſecure men from* Superſtition, *if you will make them* Atheiſts; *Unleſs you think ſuch Atheiſts as* Diagoras *and* Theodorus *could be tainted with it, whoſe Opinions did not only root out* Superſtition, *which contains in it a vain and needleſs fear of God, but true Religion too, which conſiſts in a right worſhip of the Deity.*

The reaſons which this learned Heathen aſſigns of the names and differences between *Superſtition* and *Religion*, *Lactantius* likes not, and therefore when he had derived *Religion à Religando*; of *Superſtition* he ſpeaks thus: *Superſtitioſi vocantur ii, qui ſuperſtitum memoriam defunctorum colunt, aut qui parentibus ſuis ſuperſtitibus colebant Imagines eorum domi tanquam Deos penates. Nam qui novos ſibi ritus aſſumebant, ut in Deorum vicem mortuos honorarent quos ex hominibus in cœlum receptos putabant, hos* Superſtitioſos

Lactant. de verâ ſapientiâ Cap. 28.

vocabant; eos vero qui publicos & Antiquos deos colerent, Religiosos *nominabant, unde* Virgilius,

Vana superstitio veterúmq; ignara Deorum.

They were counted Superstitious *who did honour to the memory of the dead, or who while their Parents were alive, worshipped their Images as if they were Household Gods: for they who took up any new Rites, in giving honour to dead men, whom they thought to be taken up to Heaven among the Gods, were so called; whereas they were esteemed* Religious, *who confined themselves to the worship of those who were anciently reputed for Deities. Hence* Virgil *introduces* Evander, *excusing himself to* Æneas, *that the Honour he did to* Hercules *did not deserve the name of* Superstition.

Sect. 3. There want not other Etymologies of this word. *Isidore* is quoted for

for this, *Superſtitio quaſi ſuperſtatuta obſervatio. An unſtatutable, unwarrantable obſervation. Alii dicunt à ſenibus, quia multis annis ſuperſtites per ætatem delirant*: then is introduced *Lucretius, qui ſuperſtitionem dicit ſuperſtantium rerum*, i.e. *cœleſtium quæ ſuper nos ſtant*, for which theſe Verſes are quoted where he huffs at all *Religion*.

M. Delrii Diſquiſ. Magic. lib. 1. Cap. 1.

Humana ante Oculos fœdè cùm vita jaceret,
In terris oppreſſa gravi ſub Relligione,
Quæ caput è Cœli regionibus oſtendebat,
Horribili ſuper aſpectu mortalibus inſtans.

(So not only *Delrio*, but *Turnebus* alſo reads that Verſe which others read thus,

Adverſar. lib. 10. Cap. 26.

Horribili aſpectu ſemper mortalibus inſtans.)

according to *Lucretius*, all *Religion*, becauſe it concerns it ſelf in things above us, (with which that *Atheiſt* thought we had nothing to do) de-

serves the name of *Superstition.*

Whatever the first Reason of this appellation might be, thus much is certain, that in ordinary use, it signified somewhat undue in Divine Worship; and of this *Tully* was aware, when he made the acknowledgment, of which *Lactantius* forgot to take notice. *Quod Nomen patuit postea latius.* Also *Nigidius Figulus* in his Comment upon the old Verse,

Religentem esse oportet, Religiosum nefas.

takes *Religiosus* in an ill sense as all one with *Superstition. Religiosus is appellabatur qui nimiâ & superstitiosâ Religione sese alligaverat, eaq; res vitio assignabatur. He who was* superstitious *in his* Religion *(which was counted a Crime) was called a* Religious *man.*

A. Gellii Noct. Attic. lib. 4. Cap. 9.

Seneca expresses the Import of this word

Senec. Epist. 123.

word well, according to the Greek: *Superstitio error insanus est, amandos timet, quos colit violat, quid enim interest utrum Deos neges an infames? Superstition is a wild kind of error, it is afraid of him who ought to be loved, and dishonours him whom it worships, for what difference is there whether you deny God or blaspheme him?* In a former Epistle he discourses thus. *Audiat quemadmodum se gerere in sacrificiis debeat, quam procul resilire à molestis* superstitionibus. *Nunquam satis profectum erit, nisi qualem debet Deum mente conceperit. He who desires to understand himself and his Religion, let him retire as far as he can from troublesome superstitions. No man will proceed well in Religion, who hath not right Conceptions of God.* Id. Epist. 95.

In a like sense do other Latin Authors use the word, when they upbraid Christian Religion under that name, as apprehending it a false Religion. So *Tacitus* when he speaks of

Nero's laying the blame of the burning of *Rome* upon the Christians, calls their way *Exitiabilis Superstitio, A pestilent Superstition.* *Suetonius* also in the life of the same *Nero*, calls the Christians, *Genus hominum superstitionis novæ & maleficæ. A sort of men of a new and mischievous Superstition.* And *Pliny* to *Trajan*, gives Christian Religion the same name though with somewhat a softer Epithet. *Superstitio prava & immodica, An Immoderate Superstition.*

Histor. August. lib. 15.

Vit. Neron. Cap. 16.

This is then the Account I gather out of Heathen Authors, mostly hitherto: the sense they had of a Deity perswaded them not only that he ought to be worshipped, but also that every kind of service would not be acceptable to him. The right worship of God (that which they so apprehended) they called *Religion*, that which was undue, and therefore unacceptable, passed under

der the name of *Superſtition*. Even as *Feſtus* did apply the name to the Religion of the Jews, as eſteeming it not the beſt way of worſhip. And St. *Paul* more truly, did ſo reprove the Idolatry of *Athens*. Acts 25. Acts 17.

When the World was better inſtructed in the Notion of a Deity, and in the manner of worſhip that was due to him, we find the word ſtill in uſe among Chriſtian Authors. *Lactantius* hath been offered already. St. *Auſtin* comprehends Idolatry and many other particular Cuſtoms under this Term. *Superſtitioſum eſt, quicquid inſtitutum eſt ab hominibus ad facienda & colenda Idola, pertinens vel ad colendam, ſicut Deum, creaturam partémve ullam Creaturæ, vel ad conſultationes & pacta quædam ſignificationum cum Dæmonibus placita atq; fœderata, qualia ſunt molimina Magicarum artium, &c. Ex quo genere ſunt Haruſpicum & Augurum libri, etiam omnes ligaturæ atq;* De Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ lib. 2. Cap. 20.

atq; remedia quæ medicorum disciplina condemnat, sive in præcantationibus sive in quibusdam notis quas characteres vocant. Idolatry and consulting with the Devil, or any kind of Witchcraft: The practices of Soothsayers, that would pretend to foretel future Events by the flying of Birds or Entrails of Beasts: Those Charms that are designed for the Cure of Diseases, of which no natural or physical account can be given: These and divers like Observations he taxes with *Superstition.*

And some of those (or others like them) which St. *Austin* there mentions, obtain still in the World: *viz.* If Rats do any mischief, to be afraid of that as an ill Omen of some death or disaster in the Family: And many other as unaccountable. If it rain or snow such a day, or be fair such a day (as *Candlemas*, and *Swithin*, and others) then the future part of the

the year will be ſo or ſo. Theſe Obſervations have upon this account been eſteemed *Superſtitious*, becauſe they are taken to be an indication of the pleaſure of God as to future Events, whereas we have no aſſurance that they are a ſufficient indication. And it may deſerve enquiry, whether the Cuſtom of praying God to bleſs perſons when they *ſneeze*, were not originally *ſuperſtitious*. I determine not in this caſe, becauſe *ſneezing* hath been ſometimes reckoned a Diſeaſe, and then praying for ſuch an one, is of the ſame import, with praying for any one in danger: but I make the doubt, becauſe *ſneezing* hath been ſometimes reckoned an Omen of good or bad luck, and St. *Auſtin* mentions this in the ſame place where he ſpeaks of *Millia inaniſſimarum obſervationum*, when a man does *redire ad lectum ſi dum ſe calceat ſternutaverit*. Id. ibid.

nutaverit. If a man chance to *sneeze while he is putting on his shooes he must to bed again.* These and a Thousand such observances as these, are deemed to have a relation to God, when it cannot be proved, and are therefore judg'd *superstitious*, so far as there is any Religion placed in them.

I proceed no further in examining the use of the word, than to give Three Definitions of it, from Three men of several Ages, and several ways and Opinions, but such as do all amount to one and the same purpose.

Secunda secundæ qu. 92. Art. 1, & 2.

Aquinas gives it thus: *Superstitio est vitium Religioni oppositum secundum excessum, quo quis divinum exhibet cultum vel cui non debet, vel non eo modo quo debet.* And in the next Article concludes. *Multæ sunt superstitionis species ut Indebitus veri Dei cultus, Idololatria, Divinationes & varia observationum genera.*

Zanch

Zanchy to the same purpose. *Manifestum est superstitionem esse Religioni oppositam & per excessum.* He adds, *Unde etiam fit ut omnis falsus cultus superstitio appelletur.* Tom. 4. lib. 1. Cap. 17.

Ames also says thus. *Superstitio est quâ Deo cultus indebitus exhibetur*, and again, *Superstitio dicitur excessus Religionis.* The sum of all which is, as *Atheism* is a *defect* of *Religion*, so is *Superstition* an extream on the other hand, an *Excessive Religiousness*, when men go beyond their bounds in Divine Worship; so that all false worship goes under the name of *Superstition.* A man may be righteous over-much, and over-much wise, so may he also be, not too holy or too good, yet too *religious*, when he exceeds, and practises in matters of Religion upon Opinions false and unworthy of God. Medul. Theolog. lib. 2. Cap. 13.

This hath been the use of the word in approved Authors of divers Ages.

Ages. It hath sometimes been determined to particular practices, as Magick and Enchantments; but upon a general reason, because these are undue mixtures in Religion, for so both in Heathen and Christian Authors this difference is commonly assigned between them. *Religio est veri Cultus, superstitio falsi,* as *Lactantius* hath it. When we worship God aright that is *Religion,* when by any undue additions we corrupt *Religion,* in all those things we are *superstitious.*

Ubi prius.

Sect. 4. 2. The Enquiry into the Nature of the thing still remains. Whereby does it appear, whether the worship we here, or others elsewhere perform to God be regular and *Religious*, or excessive & undue, and so *superstitious*? The Resolution I give to this question, I form into these Propositions.

1. *Superstition is first in the Opinion, and thence influences upon the practice.*

2. *The Doctrines upon which the Conformity*

formity of the Church of England *is eſtabliſhed, are not ſuperſtitious Opinions.*

3. *The Opinions that are indeed ſuperſtitious (ſuch as are divers that obtain in the Papacy and elſewhere) are rejected by the Church of* England.

4. *There are ſuperſtitious Omiſſions, of which men may be guilty, and that then, when they ſeem to have a great Zeal againſt Superſtition.*

1. *Superſtition is firſt in the Opinion before it can have any influence upon the practice.* Practices are unlawful, when they tranſgreſs the Commands by which they are obliged, but *ſuperſtitiouſly* unlawful they cannot be, unleſs they proceed from ſuch Opinions: Hence it comes to paſs, that the ſame practices are ſometimes *ſuperſtitious* and ſometimes not, according as mens Opinions are, by which they are perſwaded to them. So is the difference between the *Ch. of England*, and of *Rome*, in the uſe of the *Croſs*, in

kneeling

kneeling in the act of receiving, &c. as will afterwards appear. I am not alone in thus stating the Notion of

Bishop Durham (Morton) *Sermon on* 1 Cor. 11. 16.

Superstition. A superstitious act is that which is founded upon a superstitious Opinion. It was not meerly the Pharisees often washing, but their Opinion of some especial purgation thereby, which Christ reprehended in them. Nor was it the having an Altar for which St. Paul *reproved the* Athenians, *when he called them superstitious, but the opinion of honouring a God thereby they knew not whom.*

To a like purpose, Mr *Hooker*

Eccles. Polity. Book 5. §. 3.

Superstition is when things are abhorred or observed, with a zealous or fearful, but erroneous relation to God. And in words just before. *Superstition is always join'd with a wrong opinion touching things divine.*

Conformably to both these, say a late learned Author, *All Superstitious, or other sinful honour of the Elements, must be founded in embracing*

Falkener Libert. Eccles. B. 1. Chap. 5. Sect. 2. §. 7.

those

those false apprehensions and corrupt Doctrines which our Church rejects.

Δεισιδαιμονία refers to the inward sense and apprehension of our minds: or if it must be distinguished between the thoughts of the mind, and the passions of the Soul; it is evident, that fear arises from such opinions and apprehensions as administer to it. Yea though *superstition* be (as hath been said) an excess of Religion, and though this excess may discover it self in the practices of men, yet the reason and that which occasions this excess, is in the Opinion.

False Notions and apprehensions of God, tempt men to try by undue ways to please him. Men have a conceit, that such services are more grateful to him than they are: Or, there is a *superstitious* observation of some Accidents, as *Prognosticks* of Events, because of an Opinion taken

ken up, that God Almighty does by such signs declare his pleasure or displeasure.

In all these Cases, the First Seat of *Superstition* is in the *Opinion*, and from thence it is derived into practice; for did these false Opinions which thus mislead men, cease by a better information of the understanding, the practices and observances that depend on them would also cease; or if they were continued, they would be hypocritical, or vain, or any thing rather than *superstitious*. For Example: It is *superstitious* (say we) to worship an Image, or to pray a Soul out of Purgatory, &c. because they are false and *superstitious* Opinions that induce men so to do. If it may be supposed that men who opine right, who do not in their judgment yield more to an Image than they ought, and who do not in truth believe Purgatory; may yet

yet perform the ſame Ceremonies, and make the ſame prayers; I ask then, for what reaſon are theſe things done? If not for this reaſon, becauſe men are of opinion that the Image deſerves it, that the dead may be profited by their Devotions; then is it a vain and ridiculous piece of Pageantry. Or if ſome politick reaſon, and ſecular Intereſt tempt men theſe ways; what they do may be excuſed from *Superſtition*, becauſe it is not intended for the honour of God, and ſo is not performed as a part of his Worſhip, but it is otherwiſe faulty, becauſe by pretences of Religion they advance their Intereſt, and *gain* becomes their *Godlineſs*. If in truth there be any Religious intendments in theſe performances, then this is that which plainly renders them *ſuperſtitious*, becauſe they Originally proceed from *ſuperſtitious Opinions*.

This I have first said, because upon this depends the Vindication I design of the Usages of the *Church of England.* For, if what is done in Divine Worship, be not otherwise *superstitious*, but as it proceeds from and is directed by *superstitious Opinions*; then if it can be evinc'd, that we are not guided by any such Opinions, it will follow that our Rites and Ceremonies are void of *superstition.* And this I trust to make appear in what next follows.

Sect. 5. 2. *The Doctrines upon which the Conformity of the Church of* England *is established, are not superstitious Opinions.* Of which matter I give this Account, which I shall take to be sufficient, till by an Enumeration of some other particulars, of which I am not aware, it be made appear that there are some other Doctrines that may be suspected of *superstition*, which the *Church of England* in justifi-

cation

cation of her Conformity is obliged to maintain.

1. *All Circumstances relating to the Worship and service of God, are not particularly determined in the word of God.*

2. *Therefore, notwithstanding the Determinations of the Holy Scripture, some things do remain Indifferent in their own Natures.*

3. *The Governours of the Church have power to make Determinations in things Indifferent.*

4. *Therefore people are bound to obey their Governours in such their Determinations.*

5. *It is not unlawful for Church-Governours to appoint some significant Ceremonies.* These are the foundations upon which we stand; upon which our Governours require, and upon which we practise Conformity, and none of these are *superstitious* Opinions. Wherefore in the application of these Generals to our Times and

state of things, we conclude, the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Church of England* not being for their number burdensome (of which in due time) are not in their nature and kind *superstitious.*

1. *He who judges all Circumstances relating to the publick worship of God not particularly determined in the Word of God, is not superstitious in that Opinion.* For this is so plainly and manifestly true, that it is a shame for any man to deny it. There hath been (I know) an Axiome among *Cartwrights* Disciples, *That nothing ought to be established in the Church, which is not commanded in the Word of God.* This they thought plainly warranted by the manifest words of the law, *about adding to or diminishing from the Word of God.* Now (adds Mr *Hooker*) *these men having an eye to a number of Rites and Orders in the Church of* England, *such as the Ring in Marriage, the Cross,* &c. *thought*

Eccles. Pol. Book 3. §. 5.

thought by the one only ſtroke of that Axiome to have cut them off. And T.C. is quoted as arguing thus. *You which diſtinguiſh and ſay, that Matters of Faith and neceſſary to ſalvation, may not be tolerated in the Church, unleſs they be expreſly contained in the Word of God, or manifeſtly gathered; But the Ceremonies, Order, Diſcipline, Government in the Church, may not be received againſt the Word of God, and conſequently may be received, if there be no Word againſt them, although there be none for them: You I ſay diſtinguiſhing in this ſort prove an evil divider.* Ib. §. 2.

To all which there needs no other Anſwer than what Mr *Hooker* gives. *Let that which they do hereby intend, be granted them; let it once ſtand as conſonant to reaſon, that becauſe we are forbid to add to the Law of God any thing, or to take ought from it, therefore we may not for matters of the Church make any law more than is already ſet down in Scripture;* Ib. §. 6.

pture; who sees not what sentence it shall enforce us to give against all Churches in the World, in as much as there is not one, but hath had many things established in it, which though the Scripture did never command, yet for us to condemn were rashness. He goes on to give the Example of the Church of God in the time of our Saviour instead of all others.

If this ratiocination be weak, they who suspect it have great reason to shew us out of Scripture an exact form of Church-Government; but instead of doing so, they only argue that so it must be, without directing us to the place where it is. To which I again oppose Mr *Hooker's* words. *As for those marvellous discourses, whereby they adventure to argue, that God must needs have done the things which they imagine were to be done: I must confess I have often wondred at their boldness herein. When the question is, whether God hath delivered us in Scripture (as they*

Ibid. ad finem.

they affirm he hath) a compleat, particular, immutable form of Church-Polity, why take they that other both preſumptuous and ſuperfluous labour, to prove he ſhould have done it: There being no way in this caſe to prove the deed of God, ſave only by producing that Evidence wherewith he hath done it? But if there be no ſuch thing apparent upon record, they do as if one ſhould demand a Legacy by force of ſome written Teſtament, wherein there being no ſuch thing ſpecified, he pleads that there it muſt be, and brings Arguments from the love of the Teſtator, imagining that theſe proofs will convict a Teſtament to have that in it, which other men can no where by reading find.

It will appear in the proceſs of our arguing, that the very men who would inſinuate to the diſparagement of our Rites, that Divine Worſhip muſt have a Divine Warrant, for Circumſtances as well as for ſubſtance, have not themſelves been

guided by this Opinion, but have taken a liberty in their *Directorian* or Dictatorian way, which they have denied to others: And becauſe I ſhall by and by bring them as witneſſes for us and againſt themſelves, I reſpit yet a little their farther Conviction in this matter.

Sect. 6. 2. *Notwithſtanding the Determinations of the Holy Scripture, there do ſtill remain ſome things in their own nature Indifferent*; and in this Opinion there is no *Superſtition*. It might reaſonably be thought, that this Propoſition is ſo evident, that no man who pretends to learning will deny it. But ſo it is, that the power of Church-Governours may be reduc'd in a manner to nothing, ſome there have been, who will not own any thing *Indifferent* in theſe matters. I meet with two who have maintain'd this Aſſertion, and I preſume they are the ſame whom Biſhop *Saunderſon* means,

means, when he ſpeaks of ſome of this Opinion. *Duo præſertim, alter alicujus nominis apud ſuarum partium homines Theologus, alter è proceribus Regni laicus.* Thoſe Two, I conceive, muſt be Mr *Bradſhaw* and the Lord *Brooke*. *Saunderſon de Obliga. Conſcient. prælec. 6. §. 23.*

I ſhall not do Mr *Bradſhaw* right, if I do not acknowledge, that Dr *Burges* tells us, *he revers'd his Opinion of things Indifferent.* Surely he had great reaſon to do it. That he was once of the Opinion which I faſten on him, muſt not be denied. One of his Treatiſes Reprinted 1660. is Of the *Nature and uſe of things Indifferent.* Where he ſtates the Caſe thus: *A thing Indifferent is a mean between good and evil, ſo that whatſoever is Indifferent is neither good nor evil, whatſoever is either good or evil is not indifferent.* After this he avers, *that no Action of Religion, whether it be Moral or Ceremonial, is Indifferent, but either good or evil*; and again, Burges *Anſwer Rejoin'd.* Ch. 2. §. 9. Chap. 2. Chap. 8.

Ibid. again, *No Ceremony of Religion is In-different.*

A gross and palpable mistake and unworthy of a man so cryed up for his learning, the more pardonable indeed because he acknowledges his Error: but because they who Reprinted him, were not so just to his Memory as to insert that ac-knowledgment, and because they for whose sake he was reprinted have not, it may be, that respect for Dr *Burges* as to read him, I must animadvert on it as I find it, and answer, That no considering man can think, that when we use an *In-different* Rite, we mean that we do neither good nor evil. No sure, that which is *Indifferent* in its Nature, may be in its use Necessary. We use it as being by sufficient Authority com-manded thereto, and therefore up-on such reasons as justifie us that we do well; if we are mistaken in our

Judg-

Judgment, and have no ſufficient reaſon for what we do, it is ill done.

But this plainly we mean by a thing in its Nature *Indifferent*, ſomewhat which is not *in ſpecie* commanded of God, and ſo is not abſolutely neceſſary, nor is it ſo forbid, therefore not ſimply Unlawful. This Mr *Bradſhaw* might have known to have been our Notion of a thing *Indifferent*, for ſo Mr *Hooker* (at whom he ſometimes nibbles) had told him. *The nature of things Indifferent is, neither to be commanded nor forbidden, but left free and Arbitrary.* He inſtances quickly after. *When many meats are ſet before me, all are Indifferent, none Unlawful, I take one as moſt convenient. If ſcripture require me ſo to do, then is not the thing Indifferent, becauſe I muſt do what ſcripture requires. They are all Indifferent, I might take any; ſcripture does not require me to make any ſpecial choice*

Eccleſ. Polity, Book 2. §. 4.

choice of one, I do notwithſtanding make choice of one, my diſcretion teaching me ſo to do. Now though eating of this diſh rather than another, cannot be ſaid, after my choice is made, to be neither good nor evil, (for I chuſe diſcreetly or indiſcreetly) yet before my choice determin'd me to one, they were both *Indifferent* (ſo in their nature they ſtill remain) neither commanded, neither forbidden, neither neceſſary, neither unlawful in its own Nature.

So in the Circumſtances of Religion, after my choice is determined by the Command of my Superiors, theſe things are not ſo *Indifferent* as that I do neither well nor ill in my obedience. Before they had determined they found theſe things *Indifferent* in their Nature, their diſcretion having guided them to make choice of ſuch a Veſture, *&c.* as they apprehended convenient, now that becomes

becomes neceſſary as to uſe, which at the ſame time remains *Indifferent* in its Nature.

The Lord *Brooke* by a little Metaphyſicalneſs goes farther, and from this principle, *Optimum eſt ſemper eligendum*, endeavours to prove this Concluſion. That *there is nothing Indifferent* in Re & in ſe, *but to our Underſtandings ſome things ſeem ſo, for want of good light, but in the things themſelves every thing*, pro hic & nunc, *is either Neceſſary or Unlawful.* It may ſeem harſh to ſay that a man is not always obliged to do that which is *beſt*. Where there is an apparent difference and inequality in the matter of our actions, how far a man may ſatisfie himſelf to do that which is *good*, though he do not always that which is *beſt*, I digreſs not to examine. The Aſſertion may be founded upon another reaſon and ſtate of things, and upon that I build and ſay,

Sect. 7. *Diſc. opening the Nature of Epiſcop.* Ch. 5.

ſay, There is a Truth in this Propo-
ſition, *A man is not always obliged to d*
that which is beſt ; the reaſon is, be-
cauſe in ſome Caſes there is no *Beſt*
but the ſeverals that fall under deli-
beration are alike, no more Intrin-
ſick Good or Evil in one tha
another, but any of them if it wer
alone, were ſufficiently eligible an
ſatisfactory. Now if in every actio
of a mans life he muſt not proceed
till he can find a difference wher
none is to be found ; If a man mu
no where act, till he ſee clearl
what is beſt to be done, this mu
needs fill the minds of men with In
finite ſcruples and perpetual anxie
ties : And after a man is ſatisfie
that this is good and lawful and f
to be done, yet muſt he demur an
take heed he do it not, leſt perad
venture ſomewhat elſe were bette
to be done in the room of it. I giv
Inſtances whereby it will appea

we are not left to endleſs doubts in all Caſes.

I am at Table and have many Diſhes of meat before me which pleaſe me well, I care not to eat of all, but make my choice as it may happen, I cannot ſay it is *Beſt* to eat of this or that, either that which is commended to me, or that which is next me, or ſome like accident determines my choice, and if I had eaten ſomewhat elſe it would have been equally to my ſatisfaction. Otherwiſe, ſhould I ſit ſtill and diſpute with my ſelf thus? I muſt do that which is *Beſt*, therefore I muſt conſider of every Diſh by it ſelf, and diligently obſerve all the differences between them, and if I cannot clearly diſcern which is beſt of all, I muſt ſit ſtill till I can: ſo I might loſe my Dinner, and when I riſe, ſhould find my mind as unſatisfied as my belly. Or, I am travelling and take

up

up in a Town where I never wa
before; I see divers fair Inns befor
me, know none; nor have I an
manner of reason to prefer one t
another. I go to one as it happen
not out of this principle that I mu
do that which is *best*, for they are a
alike, all *Indifferent*, and if I chu
not till I certainly know which
best for me, I may lie in the stree
all Night. Once more, I go to *Lo*
don to buy somewhat that I wan
without any other Intereſt or Ac
quaintance than my money. Man
Shops sell the same Commodities,
can give no reason (but this onl
that I must buy somewhere) wh
I call at the sign of the *Sun*, or th
Moon, the *Lyon*, or the *Bear*. The
are all alike, only some acciden
(without full perswasion that I d
that which is best) determines me
And an Hundred such like Case
happen in the Course of Affairs.

Now

Now in all these, what shall we say to *Bradshaw*? Cannot these things be *Indifferent*, unless what I do be neither good nor bad? No sure. Till I have made my choice, it is *Indifferent*, because I am under no Command in these Cases, but am left perfectly to the conduct of my own discretion. And what shall we answer to *Brooke*? Must I not stir till I know which is *Best*? There is no *Best* nor *Worst*. If I discern any inconvenience on one side more than on the other, then is there a difference, and I am unadvised if I do not consider it: but where I discern no difference, and yet scruple till I be satisfied which is *Best*, I shall scruple till Doomesday if I should live so long, because I have nothing to determine me but my own choice. It remains then, that there are things *Indifferent* in their own Nature. Where there is no Antece-

dent Command to make such an Action necessary, nor Antecedent prohibition to make it unlawful, it is *Indifferent* in it self, not between good and evil, but between commanded and forbidden, between absolutely necessary and simply unlawful.

I have laid my Foundation thus low in a Consideration of the Nature of things, because the Objectors I deal with goe thus far. It is not necessary to our Cause to affirm, that the Ceremonies of Religion in Controversy (the *Surplice* and *Cross*, *&c.*) are altogether so *Indifferent*, as that there should be no more reason to determine rather to one, than there is to take one Inn or Shop rather than another. These Instances were produc'd to show where the Rule fails, *Optimum est semper faciendum*, and to prove that there are things *Indifferent* in their own nature.

To

To which I add, that ſome Rites and Ceremonies of our Religion are ſo too, as I prove by this Irrefragable Argument. Whatſoever is *in ſpecie*, neither commanded nor forbidden (*i. e.* antecedently to humane laws) is a thing *Indifferent* in its own nature. But the *Surplice* and the *Croſs*, and *Kneeling*, &c. are *in ſpecie* neither Commanded nor forbidden. *Ergo* they are *Indifferent*.

They who deny the *Major* fight with their own ſhadows, and gainſay out of a ſpirit of oppoſition; for we perſiſt in this (and they know it) that we mean nothing elſe by a thing *Indifferent* in its own nature, but ſomewhat left undetermin'd in the Holy Scripture. They who deny the *Minor*, muſt prove theſe things in the uſe of them forbid in Scripture; which if they ſhall endeavour to do, I doubt not but to pronounce them *ſuperſtitious*, and ſhall in the

Concluſion prove it. In the mean time, becauſe Negatives are hard to be proved, it concerns them to confute us by producing the Texts which forbid them: which Texts if they be no other than the *ſecond Commandment*, or that in *Coloſſ.* 2. about *will-worſhip*, or *Matthew* 15. *Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men*, or ſome ſuch like theſe, then I demand farther, In as much as the *Surplice*, &c. are not named in any of theſe places, by what good Conſequence, by what Demonſtrative Syllogiſm ſhall it be proved from ſuch a Text that it is not lawful to wear a *Surplice*? Here now will be the failure, they quote Texts from whence they declaim, but they do not argue cloſely and cogently. We know we do not add to the word of God (whether they do not *Ipſi viderint*, and I ſhall anon endeavour to open their Eyes) We do not teach

for

for *Doctrines* the *Commands of men*. We do not urge humane Impoſitions upon account of Divine Inſtitution (any otherwiſe than as it is the appointment of God to obey Authority) Wherefore when ſuch a Text is one of the premiſes, we fear not with Confidence to aver, that this cannot be a good Concluſion. *Ergo*, to wear a *Surplice* is not *Indifferent* in its Nature but a Sin. But of this a little more hereafter.

Now I farther proceed and ſay, The *Church of England* does not reckon theſe things ſo *Indifferent* as to partake nothing of the nature of good or evil (which is *Bradſhaws* falſe Notion) or ſo *Indifferent* that all other things that may come in competition with them are as equal to them as one Shop or Inn may be to another. For Example. *Kneeling* is not ſo *Indifferent* that there is no more to be ſaid for it, than for lying

along. A *White Garment* not so *Indifferent* as that any other colour would be altogether as grave and decent: but therefore *Indifferent*, because undetermin'd in Scripture. Nevertheless, when the Governours of the Church have descended to consider, what is expedient to be done in these matters, the determinations which they have made, have not been by chance as a man goes to his Inn, but they have proceeded according to the Rules of Christian Prudence (and it is to be hoped they may be allowed to do so, as well as the *Assembly* who in their *Directory* so profess, as will presently be said) The general Rules of Decency, Order, and Edification have set them their bounds. According to the best of their Wisdom, they have judged such and such Impositions expedient, and therefore have so determin'd concerning them.

Which

Which determinations when they are once made, so far as the Lord *Brooks* Notion is true, it serves our turn very well, *Optimum est faciendum.* We have so much Reverence for our Superiours, as to judge they have determin'd us to that, which they thought most fit and expedient: then for our own practice, we still esteem these things *Indifferent* in their nature, but necessary as to use. Being satisfied that the Holy Scripture does not forbid such usages, we count them lawful. Being also satisfied that our Governours command them, now by virtue of a Law Intervening, they are necessary to us, because we are commanded to obey our Governours in all lawful things.

These things pertaining to the Propositions that next follow, I go on.

3. *It is no superstitious Opinion to be-* Sect. 8.

lieve, that the Church may make determi-nations in things Indifferent. Our fore-mention'd *Lord Brooke* boggles here, I muſt therefore conſider what he ſays.

Ib. Chap. 6. Firſt, He concludes thus. *The Church hath no power to make any one thing Indifferent in it ſelf.* (That, ſay I, ſhe need not do, for ſhe finds them *Indifferent.*) *Again* (he ſays) *we cannot ſay the Church hath power to determine what is Indifferent. In things that ſeem Indifferent, where neither of the extreams is neceſſary, there (eſpecially when both are doubtful)* [he conceives] *the Church hath not power to determine to either extream. As ſuppoſe Black and White Colours ſhould be doubtful, whether both or either, or neither were lawful; In this Caſe* (ſays he) *for ought I yet ſee, the Church hath no power to determine any one ſo doubting, either to Black or White; the reaſon is, becauſe neither is neceſſary, there being ſo many Intermediate Colours between*

between both. That is as much as to ſay (if theſe things be applyed) Miniſters may be determin'd neither to a *White Surplice*, nor to a *Black Gown*, becauſe there are other Colours, and rather than the Church ſhall determine to one, Miniſters ſhall be left to their liberty, to dreſs themſelves in a Fools Coat. But he goes on to cut ſhort the Churches power. *When one of the extreams, between which we waver as Indifferent, is neceſſary to be embrac'd, as in moſt caſes it is, here all the power lawful* (as he conceives again) *can do no more but reſolve which of the two extreams is beſt.*

And is not this hitherto pretty well? A *ſurplice* cannot be ſaid to be neceſſary, becauſe a man may wear a Gown, or Cloak, or Coat, or Mantle, or if he be diſpoſed, may nakedly hold forth the Truth. *Kneeling* is not neceſſary becauſe a man may

may stand, or sit, or loll, or ly a-long. What then? Is it therefore unlawful for the Church to determine to some one of these? No sure; for according to the latter Conception, when one extream is necessary to be embrac'd, the Church may resolve which is best. And this is the Case here. For though no one of the two be necessary, yet some one of them all must be embrac'd. For the Sacrament cannot be received but in some posture or other, &c. I conceive therefore his Lordships latter Conception, in the very birth of it pulls the former by the heel and supplants it. For if the Church may resolve which of the two extreams is best, where one is necessary; with as much reason may she resolve which of four or five is best, because some one of them must be embrac'd. Or else it will follow, because a Pulpit is not

necessary

ecessary, in as much as a man may reach in a Tub (at leaſt if it be ſet on a Treſſle) becauſe a Folio Bible is not neceſſary in as much as a man may read in a leſſer print; becauſe a Communion Cup of Silver is not neceſſary, there being other Metals; therefore the *Eccleſiaſtical Court* may not compel a man to pay to the Church-Wardens rate, when he hath provided theſe things. And what a bleſſed Reformation will this be!

And yet it ſeems there is danger leſt the powers already given ſhould be too large, wherefore he limits again. *This power wherever it is muſt be very warily exerciſed, ſince of all two extreams* (and according to his Principles the Caſe will be the ſame, where four, or five, or twenty things are oppoſed) *only one can be lawful, ſo that one is wholſome and the other poyſon.* But where at laſt is this power? Idem ibid.

power? be it little or much, let us know its bounds. *The Church hath a Judicative declarative power, like the Judges in* Westminster-Hall, *but not a legislative power, as the* King *and* Parliament. If a man may be bold to ask again, Who is this Church? You shall find his *Lordship* give a noble answer. *By the Church here I mean* (says he) *not only one, or two, or a few of what rank soever, but all, even every true Member of the whole Church; for I conceive every such member hath* de jure, *a Vote in this Determination.*

A right Oecumenical Council indeed, when every member of the body must be conven'd to declare his Opinion, about any Rite or Ceremony that shall happen to be called into question. If I may add a Conception of my own, I should think it worth enquiring, whether Women and Children be not true Members of the whole Church, the

liberty

liberty of whoſe Conſciences may be as little impoſed upon as that of us men. Well, to gratifie his Lordſhip we will ſuppoſe what is Impoſſible to be put in practice: Every true Member of the whole Church, awaken'd and alarm'd with the ſcruples of *John a Nokes*, about the poſture in which the Sacrament is to be received; is met together to declare and determine what is beſt to be done. Now, if ever the Mountains brought forth a Mouſe, you ſhall ſee how little this Convention ſignifies; for when every Calves-Head hath ſpoke an Oracle, every one paſſed their Vote, let us Imagine that ſome one among them (and it is hardly poſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe) ſhould be diſſatisfied and diſſent from the Judgment of the greateſt part of the Church, and after reading and praying ſhould continue to diſſent, *In this caſe* (he conceives Ibid.

ceives once more) *no power on earth ought to force that mans practice more than his judgment.*

Liberty! Oh sweet Liberty! What pity it is the *Lord Brooke* hath not another life to lose in defence of this Gospel liberty. But seriously (so far as amazement will admit) are not things now brought to a strange Conclusion? Will it not be perfectly in vain, to determine any thing at all about Church-Matters? For, even in those things that seem *Indifferent*, one is *Best*, the other *Unlawful*. When the Church hath resolved which *is best*, yet every man must be left to do what he *thinks best*. So is the State of the Church as deplorable as ever was that of the Com-
Judges 21. mon-wealth of *Israel*. *In those dayes when there was no King in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own Eyes.*

There are many other scurvy passages

paſſages in that ill-natur'd Book, and many Unworthy Reflections upon my Lords the Biſhops that then were: but I muſt not digreſs to take notice of them. This proceſs of his is ſufficiently expoſed by this account of it.

I confeſs I have met with two other Pamphlets that alſo demur in this thing. *A Modeſt Diſcourſe concerning Ceremonies*, believes that the *Churches Authority in commanding matters of Indifferency, wants ground from Scripture.* Page 1. And Mr *Bagſhaw* in his *Two great queſtions concerning things Indifferent in Religious Worſhip*, holds it *utterly unlawful for any Chriſtian Magiſtrate to impoſe the uſe of them.* Page 2. But neither of them are ſo extravagant, as to deny that there is any thing *Indifferent*, only they think what God hath not determin'd, men may not. Againſt whom I oppoſe to this purpoſe.

Either

Either Church-Governours have power in theſe Caſes to determine, or all people muſt be left to their liberty, to determine for themſelves. But what intolerable diſorder and confuſion would that bring into the Church? Then would God be the *Author of confuſion* and *not of peace.* There is then no power now left in the Church, that may take care that things be done *decently* and in *order:* but this is orderly and decent, that every man ſhould have liberty to break Order, and go his own way. And if in forms and modes of worſhip there could be as many differences (as thoſe that are, are not few) as men, it might be lawful for every man to go by himſelf, and a ſingle perſon ſhould conſtitute a Church. Men would never agree neither about time, nor place of publick Worſhip, nor about the perſon that ſhould teach them and pray for them,

them, nor about the manner of publick Prayers, or publick Preaching, nor about the form of adminiſtring the Sacraments, nor is it eaſy to name any one thing in the publick worſhip of God, wherein all men would be of one mind, but if all were left to their liberty when Church-Governours have determin'd as they think moſt expedient; every private perſon ſhall have a Negative Vote, and if he like not to worſhip God in the ſame way as others do, he muſt paſs without controul to worſhip as he pleaſes, or if it ſo pleaſe him, not to worſhip at all.

But theſe are but the *Capricio*'s of ſome few particular men, the vanity of which I need not labour much to ſhew, becauſe however the Fox pronounces the Grapes ſowr which he cannot reach; however ſome diſcontented men quarrel at the

power of the Keys, when they do not hang at their own Girdle, yet there never was any body of men, that did at any time uſurp a power to make Laws, and determine in Church Affairs, but did proceed upon this Principle, that it is lawful to make determinations in things *Indifferent*; and plain it is that the *Preſbyterians* and *Independents* both, allow what I now contend for.

Sect. 9. The *Preſbyterians* in the Preface to their *Directory*, diſtinguiſh ſome things to be of Divine Inſtitution, and others not, and of theſe they ſay: *Other things we have endeavoured to ſet forth according to the Rules of Chriſtian prudence, agreeable to the general rules of the Word of God.* Alſo in their *Confeſſion of Faith* ſet out with their Catechiſms they define: *That it belongs to Synods and Councils to ſet down rules and directions for better ordering the publick worſhip of God and Government*

Aſſemb. Conf. of Faith. Ch. 31.

vernment of his Church, which Decrees and determinations if Conſonant to the word of God (where it is worthy obſerving, that when they are eſtabliſhing their own Authority and way, they expect not expreſs Commands for every thing they do, however they have been obſerved to huff at Epiſcopacy and to require Commands for our eſtabliſhments) *are to be received with reverence and ſubmiſſion, not only for their agreement with the word, but alſo for the power whereby they are made, as being an Ordinance of God appointed thereto in his word.*

Since theſe firſt attempts of the *Aſſembly*, we find ſome writing conformably to their dictates and profeſſing thus. *We freely grant that the Civil power, or the Church (orderly aſſembled) may determine at what hours on the Lords-day the Congregation ſhall meet, as alſo it ſhall determine particular times for Faſting or Thankſgiving, as Gods provi-* *Diſcourſe Liturg. &c. Chap. 16.*

dence shall administer Occasions, (and yet some of this way are against keeping *Christmass*, &c.) *that places of publick worship shall be erected, frequented, kept decent, and an* Hundred *things of that Nature, which even reason and nature it self teaches all sober persons to be such, as that without some Order to be observed in them, the worship of God either would not be performed, or would be undecently performed.*

True it is that the same men say in the same *Chapter*, *The Assertion of the Churches power in appointing Ceremonies and Circumstances of Divine Worship is the very root of all, the* Pandora's *Box, the very Fountain head of all those Impositions, which have bred so much trouble, disturbance, and persecutions in the Church of God.* Which how to reconcile to what is just now quoted, I well know not, nor to another passage in the same *Chapter*, where though they desire to distinguish be-

tween *Circumſtances* and *Ceremonies* of worſhip, yet they acknowledge thus. *That the word of God hath left many things (not poſſible to be determin'd by it) to the Authority of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate cannot be denied, whether any Ceremonies or no is a queſtion, divers Circumſtances relating to the worſhip of God, are undoubtedly ſo left.*

When I compare theſe things, I know not how to underſtand the Coherence of them, unleſs it be thus. When Church-Governours are *Epiſcopal*, and ſhall aſſume a power to appoint Ceremonies and Circumſtances of divine worſhip, this is the *fountain head of Impoſitions that breed diſturbance and perſecutions*: But if they ſhall chance to be *Preſbyterian*, then there are an *Hundred things not determin'd by the word of God*, but left to their Chriſtian Prudence. For Example: A Convocation may not by a *Canon* or *Rubrick* appoint, *a font*

of stone at the West end of the Church, nor *kneeling* at the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, nor that the Bread and Wine be severally distributed to every Communicant, but the *Directory* may make appointments contrary to all these and an *hundred* things of the like nature. For the Ordinance of *Parliament* (all the Authority it had) which established the *Directory*, says. *The Directory for publick worship herein set forth, shall henceforth be used, pursued, and observed, in all exercises of the publick worship of God, in every Congregation, Church, Chappel, and place of publick Worship, within this Kingdom of* England, *and Dominion of* Wales.

The *Independents* in their *Confession of Faith*, set out from the *Savoy*, 1658. speak to the same purpose. *There are some Circumstances concerning the worship of God and Government of the Church, common to Humane Actions and Societies,*

chap. 1. Sect. 6.

Societies, which are to be Ordered by the light of Nature, and Chriſtian prudence, according to the General Rules of the word, which are always to be obſerved.

Now I muſt crave leave that our Adverſaries would judge whether they are not unequal to us, in denying us a liberty which they grant to themſelves. In this general Conſideration of things, it is not material to ask for what reaſon they ſcruple our Ceremonies, whether as ſignificant or popiſh, *&c.* which ſhall be examined in due time. All that I now conclude, is no more than what they themſelves believe and practiſe, *viz.* It is no *ſuperſtitious Opinion* to believe that the Church may make Determinations in things *Indifferent.*

4. *Where the Governours of the Church have power to determine, it can be no ſuperſtitious opinion to believe, they ought to be obeyed, in the exerciſe of this their lawful* Sect. 10.

ful power. Yea, if it should be granted (what I do not by any means grant, only to come as close as may be to our Adversaries, I suppose the case) that it is not well done to Impose such things *Indifferent*; yet if they be not in their own nature evil, it is better to obey than to disturb the peace of the Church, and to separate from established order. *Zanchy* and *Calvin* are professedly our Advocates in this Matter, on whose Testimony I build the more, because they are of great Authority with those who dissent from us.

Zanchy wrote a Letter to Queen *Elizabeth*, wherein he did earnestly perswade her not to Impose the *Surplice* and such like things upon the Clergy of *England*. This he did with great Zeal, and it may seem with some acrimony; as if he had been a great Patron of *Non-Conformity*, and I will not deny that it seems by that Letter

Zanch Epistol. lib. 1. p. 111. Tom. ult.

Letter he did greatly diſlike ſuch Impoſitions; and but that he was commanded by his Prince to write as he did (he did *Coactus ſcribere* as he profeſſes) it is a Letter that might argue him to meddle too much in the affairs of another Church: but we take it as we find it, and notwithſtanding all that is there ſaid, it is manifeſt that *Zanchy* was of our ſide.

That he was abuſed in the Information that was given him of our affairs, appears by his Letter to the *Queen*, wherein he complains of her introducing and eſtabliſhing all the Maſſing attire of the Romiſh Prieſts, for ſo he calls them. *Veſtes albas ac lineas, quibus in papatu utuntur ſacrifici: Antichriſti ſupellectilem: Papiſtarum Impiam pompam: Idololatriæ & ſuperſtitionis Papiſticæ reliquias vel ſaltem ſymbola*: that is in the Engliſh of ſome of our Malecontents, All the *rags* of the

whore

whore of Babylon. Whereas the attire of their Priests is made up of six Vestments (as a Learned man of our own hath observed out of their Ritualists) *Amictus*, *Alba*, *Cingulum*, *Stola*, *Manipulus*, *Capsula*, all far different from the *Surplice*; and these *six Garments are accounted holy Garments used by their Priests, and all of them have their particular Consecrations, as the Surplice in the Church of* Rome *hath not.* *Zanchy* then thus mistaking the case was more eager than he needed to have been, but he was under another and greater mistake.

Falkner Libert. Ecclesiast. lib. 2. Cap. 4. §. 9.

It was reported to him that there was great danger, lest many pious men should be turn'd out of their Livings upon this Occasion; yea, it was told him, that there were *plerique Episcopi* (that must be some considerable number of the Twenty six that are in *England* and *Wales*) *Viri omni eruditione & pietate insignes, qui*

malue

malint Officio & loco cedere quam istiusmodi vestes admittere. There were many Bishops that would not conform. Now who that knows any thing of the State of the *Church of England*, *Anno* 1571. (when that Letter was written) knows not that the Bishops of that time were sufficiently satisfied with the Conformity that was then urged, nor was there one among them (for so far as I can now find) that made so much noise about these things as Bishop *Hooper* of *Glocester* did under *Edward* the Sixth: If therefore *Zanchy* may be excused for endeavouring what he could in favour of those good and Learned men whose exauctoration he fear'd; yet that not being the case, the earnestness of his Letter (if we should yield more to his judgment than of necessity we are obliged to do) will not signify much to the reproach of our Conformity. But

But we have greater assurance that *Zanchy* was our Friend: For when he had dated his Letter to the *Queen* from *Heidelberg*, *Sept.* 10. 1571. he dates another the very next day to Bishop *Juell* (though it be doubtful whether he lived to receive it, because he died the 23*d* of the same Month) from the tenor of which I conclude, that in his Letter to the *Queen* he says nothing to prove the usages of our Church unlawful to be practis'd, (whatever his opinion might be of the conveniency of Imposing them) or if he did, he unsays it again the very next day in his Letter to the *Bishop*, which of so Learned and fix'd a man, is not easily to be believed. For the very occasion of that second Letter, was to desire Bishop *Juell* and other Bishops, to use their Authority with the rest to perswade. *Ne si Regina amoveri nullo modo possit à sententiâ, ipsi propterea*

Zanch. Epist. ib. 2. p. 111. Ton. ult.

propterea ſuas deſerere malint ſtationes, quam edicto Regio obtemperare. If the Queen were reſolv'd and would be obey'd, he would have all the Clergy *rather obey than leave their places and Employments.* He goes on to declare his Opinion, that for ſuch things as theſe, Miniſters may not leave their Flocks: He acknowledges the Caſe, that where things are in their own nature evil, we muſt with the Apoſtles *obey God rather than Man*, and then adds, *Si vero res ſuâ naturâ adiaphoræ, lege mandatoq; regio præcipiantur, quando alterutrum neceſſe ſit, ut aut cedatur loco, aut tali mandato obtemperetur, obtemperandum potius eſſe*, &c. *When the Magiſtrates command Indifferent things upon this neceſſity, that men muſt obey or forſake their Miniſtry, they muſt rather obey.* Nay he reckons this Caſe ſo clear, that he concludes: *Eſſe vero hanc ſententiam ita certam & perſpicuam, tum in ſacris literis tum apud*

patres

patres & in Historiis Ecclesiasticis, ut [illegible] *supervacaneum omnino sit, ullam adferre probationem apud illos, qui vel mediocriter in scripturis sunt exercitati. Nunquam enim propter res suâ naturâ adiaphoras, deserenda est vocatio legitima & necessaria.* They who ever consulted the Scriptures, or Fathers, or Ecclesiastical Historians, will need no proof of this, That it can never be lawful for men to leave a necessary Employment (such as that of the Ministry is) *for the sake of Indifferent Rites.*

If this will not convert a *Non-Conformist*, yet I hope it will make them asham'd to quote *Zanchy*'s Letter to the *Queen*, as if it were much to our disadvantage (as the *Replyer* upon Bishop *Mortons* defence does) let both his Letters be compar'd, and much good may they do them.

Vid. Burges *Answer Rejoin'd.* Chap. 1. Sect. 19.

That this was *Zanchy*'s setled Judgment, appears from what he elsewhere

elsewhere says, in defence of Garments peculiar to Divine Service: *Quod veteres Episcopi cœnam administraturi, aliam induerint vestem, ad mutationem cœnæ nihil pertinet. Non enim Christus jussit, ut communibus vestibus induti cœnam administraremus, sicut & ipse indutus erat, sed tantum ut faceremus quod & ipse fecit. Idem de multis aliis rebus dici potest, tam in Baptismo quam in cœnâ Dominicâ.* Whereas the *Bishops of old did celebrate the Eucharist in a peculiar Garment, this makes no change in that service, for our Lord Christ did not command us to be clothed as he was, but to do what he did.* And the same may be said of many other things, both in Baptism and the Lords Supper. Zanc. Tom. 4. de Cultu Dei externo lib. 1. Cap. 16.

The sum of all he thus expresses, *Quæ addita sunt, sed tanquam adiaphora, propter ordinem, propter decorum, & ad ædificationem, ea substantiam Sacramentorum eoq; cultum non mutarunt. Those things that are added for Order, Decency,* and

and Edification, make no alteration in the substance of the Sacraments, or of Divine Worship.

I conclude then, though we yield *Zanchy* theirs, as to his Opinion, that it is not well done to impose these *Indifferent* things, yet he is clearly ours as to the Proposition I maintain. When *Indifferent* things are once determin'd (whatever Governours may have to answer for such Impositions) because they are not in their own nature evil, it is better to obey than to disturb the peace of the Church.

Sect. 11. But Mr *Calvin* is a greater man than Dr *Zanchy*, and the cause which he condemns shall ly under a great prejudice: his opinion therefore must be consider'd. However he be generally esteemed no great friend to Episcopacy, yet M. *Durell* hath endeavour'd to vindicate him from being very Antiepiscopal. Be that as it

M. Durell *View of Government and publick worship in the Reform. Churches beyond the Seas*, pag. 161. &c.

it will; if our *N.* C^ts will ſtand or fall to *Calvins* Judgment, our advantage is as great as we need deſire.

1. For firſt he does greatly admire ſet forms of Prayer. So he ſays in a Letter to the *Protector* of *Edward* the Sixth. *Quod ad formulam precum & Rituum Eccleſiaſticorum, valdè probo, ut certa illa extet à quâ Paſtoribus diſcedere in ſuâ functione non liceat.* *I do greatly like that forms of Prayer, and the Rites of the Church ſhould be ſtated, ſo as Miniſters in the exerciſe of their function ſhould not have leave to vary from them.* His reaſons are Three, *Ut conſulatur quorundam ſimplicitati & Imperitiæ: Ut certius conſtet omnium Eccleſiarum inter ſe conſenſus. Poſtremo ut obviam eatur deſultoriæ quorundam levitati qui novationes quaſdam affectant.* *Firſt, For the ſupply of ſome mens inabilities* (a reaſon that our modern N. C^ts. in this time of Goſpel light, think an undervaluing of them) *Secondly, That the* Calv. Epiſt. 87. Dat. 1548.

several Churches (of the same Dominion) *may appear to consent together. Thirdly, For a security against Innovators* (and in that also I wish they were not concern'd.) Upon this last reason *Calvin* adds, that there should be *summa quædam doctrinæ ab omnibus recepta, quam inter prædicandum sequantur omnes, ad quam etiam observandam omnes Episcopi & Parochi jurejurando adstringantur, ut nemo ad munus Ecclesiasticum admittatur, nisi spondeat sibi illum sensum inviolatum futurum. Extet præterea communis Catechismi formula,* &c. Which I thus accommodate to our Usage, he could not think it unlawful *to subscribe to the thirty nine Articles.*

2. Because some Ceremonies must accompany Divine Service, it appears by the former words that he would have them stated too. I conceal not his Opinion, that he would have but few Ceremonies for fear of

Superstition.

Superſtition. Nihil conſultius video quam parciſſimis Ceremoniis uti in Eccleſiâ, ſatis enim Experientiâ conſtat, quàm proclivis ſit lapſus in ſuperſtitionem. Epiſt. 303. Dat. 1560.

Now if any ſhall hence infer, that *Calvin*, if he were alive, would judge us to abound in ſuperfluous Ceremonies, I oppoſe his former Letter to the *Protector*, where he ſpeaks, *de abolendis & radicitus evellendis abuſibus & corruptelis*, of *rooting out abuſes*: but he inſtances but in three things, *Praying for the dead, Chriſm* and *extream Unction*. All which having now no place in our Church, and it being undeniable that we are reformed to ſome greater degrees than in *Edward* the Sixths time, we have fair reaſon to ſay that the preſent ſtate of things is ſuch as *Calvin* would not diſallow; at moſt if he would have adviſed to have omitted ſome of our Ceremonies, yet in the ſame

place where he desires Ceremonies should be few, he adds, *Aliud vero est, cum nobis jus non est admittendi aut repudiandi quod videbitur. Si non licet obtinere quod cupimus, feramus istos defectus, non approbemus. Where we are to obey and not to rule, let us bear with those defects which we need not approve.*

3. But *Calvin* is the man, who called some of our Rites *Fooleries*. Because our N. C^ts^. shall have liberty to make the most of that word, I will translate it, though others think it may be rendred *Unfitnesses*. Let them take the advantage of it, provided they will acknowledge that at the same time he calls them *tolerable*. The words are in a Letter to some English Divines at *Frankford*, in Queen *Maries* time. *In Anglicana Liturgiâ qualem describitis, multas vidi fuisse tolerabiles Ineptias.* *Calvin* being at a distance, takes things as they were represented to him, therefore

Ep. 200. Dat. 1555.

he ſpeaks of the *Engliſh Liturgy* according to the deſcription they gave of it, and there is ſome reaſon to ſuſpect, that they who gave him that account, miſrepreſented the caſe. I am not alone in the Imagination. M. *Durell* is before me who undertakes it at large. But *Calvin* ſays moreover *video fuiſſe*: ſo it had been (he thought) in *Edward* the Sixths time, and who knows not what perfective alterations have been ſince made? Suppoſe at moſt he did not like ſome things, yet this is certain, that he did not think it worth while to contend about them, for ſo he ſays in the ſame Letter. *In rebus mediis ut ſunt externi Ritus, facilem me & flexibilem præbeo. In ſuch Indifferent matters as outward Rites are, I am an eaſy man and ready to be perſwaded.* And I give but Two Inſtances more that I may have done with him.

View of Government, &c. p. 117.

Id. ibid.

When he writes to *Bullinger* a-

bout Bishop *Hooper's* Scruples and troubles, he says, *De pileo & veste lineâ maluissem (ut illa etiam non probem) non usq; adeo ipsum pugnare, idq; etiam nuper suadebam.* Though *I do not much like the Square-Cap, and Surplice, yet I wish* Hooper *had not been so fierce against them, and so I lately perswaded him.* Yea, in an affair of their own, *Beza* reports him to have been of the same temper. Some there were at *Geneva* who had upon some pretences introduc'd the use of *Unleaven'd Bread* (and of that only) at the *Communion*: At this others were so offended, that they inclin'd, rather to stay away than Communicate. *Calvin* who was then withdrawn from *Geneva*, hearing of it, advised them, *ne ob istud ἀδιάφορον litem moverent, sic obtinuit panis Azymi usus, de quo etiam postea restitutus* Calvinus *nunquam contendendum putavit, minimè tamen dissimulans quid alioqui esset magis probaturus.* He would

Ep. 120. Dat. 1551.

Bez. Vit. Calvini. An. 1538.

would not have them quarrel about such an Indifferent matter. So the use of Unleaven'd Bread was established, which when Calvin *return'd again, he did not think fit to make any disturbance about, though he did not dissemble that he rather wished, it had been otherwise.* It appears then *Calvin* was not so inflexible in all matters of Conformity as many of our Modern N. C^ts^. are.

To *Calvin* and *Zanchy* it is easy to add like Testimonies out of other Authors magnified by the N. C^ts^. M. *Durell* hath brought about forty, mostly Divines, as it were into Council, delivering their Opinions about Ceremonies and Circumstances of worship. All unanimously agreeing against our present Dissenters, that these things, *viz. the Surplice and Cross, &c.* are not such, for which a separation is to be made: and if all do not speak to every particular matter in Controversy between

Sect. 12. M. Durell *View of Government, &c.* p. 119. & deinceps.

tween us, yet all speak to some, and some to all, by all which it appears, that the *Church* of *England* is not condemned by the *Reformed Churches* beyond the Seas, nay she is justified, nay she is admired.

For the particular purpose of the Argument now in hand, I offer a few of our own Countrymen, and I cannot begin better than with *T. Cartwright*, who is quoted as *professing to oppose our Ceremonies as inconvenient but not as unlawful, and therefore perswaded Ministers, rather to wear the Garments than cease their Ministry, and taught men to receive the Sacrament kneeling, if they could not have it otherwise, because though the gesture be (as he takes it) incommodious, yet he says it is not simply unlawful.* Mr *Sprint*, also assures us, *that* Dr *Humfrey*, Dr *Reynolds*, Dr *Sparks*, Dr *Chaloner*, Dr *Ayray*, Mr *Chaderton*, Mr *Knewstubs*, though they *stood out and testified their dislike*

Burges *Preface to Answ. Rejoin'd*, p. 3, 4.

Cassand. *Anglic.* p. 163.

diſlike againſt ſundry of the Ceremonies eſtabliſhed, yet they did in caſe of deprivation yield to them, and ſtudiouſly perſwaded others in this caſe to this practice.

Of latter days Mr *Baxter* hath determin'd, that *it may be very ſinful to command ſome Ceremonies, when yet it may be the ſubjects duty to uſe them when they are commanded.* Upon which Propoſition he ſays farther: *If a thing be ſimply unlawful, as being forbid by God himſelf, there no command of man can make it lawful: But if it be but inconvenient, or evil only by accident, or circumſtance, it is poſſible for the command of Governours to take off that accidental evil, and make it become a duty.* Baxt. *Diſputat. of Church Government,* p. 460.

I have dwelt at large upon theſe Teſtimonies, not becauſe the Reaſon of the thing is doubtful, ſo as to need ſuch a Confirmation, nor becauſe if it were, other Teſtimonies as conſiderable could not be produced,

duced, but to comply with the humor of the N. C^ts^. and to deal with them at their own Weapon. They have made a great noise about the consent of the *Reformed Churches*, and did *Covenant to endeavour a Reformation according to the Example of the best Reformed Churches*; as if all that go under the name of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, did as much believe us *Superstitious* as these men pretend to believe. Whereas beside the Veneration which *Spanhemius* expresses to have for the Order of the *Church of England*, in a time when Conformity went higher than of late days: besides *Bogerman's* acknowledgment at *Dort* to the *Bishop of Landaffe* that then was, *Domine, nos non sumus adeo fœlices*, It was their misfortune not to be under Episcopal Government; we have many more clear evidences of the great respect which Foreigners bear to the *Church of England*.

Epist. ad tertiam partem. Dub. Evangel. An. 1638.

Bishop Hall *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, Sec. 4.

I

I conclude this Propoſition with the grave and excellent determination of St. *Auſtin*, in which he gives account of St. *Ambroſe* too. *Monica* coming to *Milan*, and obſerving the Order of the Church there, that they did not faſt on *Saturday* as was uſual in other Churches, was troubled about it; for her ſatisfaction St. *Auſtin* adviſes with St. *Ambroſe*, who anſwers him, and reſolves her, by his own practice. *Cum Romam venio, jejuno Sabbato, cum hîc ſum non jejuno; ſic etiam tu ad quam forte Eccleſiam veneris, ejus morem ſerva, ſi cuiquam non vis eſſe ſcandalo, nec quenquam tibi.* *When I am at* Rome, *I faſt on* Saturday *as they do there, here I do not; ſo I would have you, whereſoever you come, obſerve the Order of the place, if you would neither give nor take offence.* An Anſwer which ſatisfied *Monica*, and paſſed for an *Oracle* with St. *Auſtin*, who adds of his own in the ſame Epiſtle: Some

Auguſtin. Januario.

Some things Univerſal tradition had ſo confirmed, that he did not think fit they ſhould be alter'd, as the Obſervation of *Eaſter* and *Whitſuntide*, &c. but then, *Alia quæ per loca terrarum variantur, ſicut eſt quod alii jejunant Sabbato, alii non, alii quotidie communicant, alii certis diebus*, &c. *& ſi quid aliud hujuſmodi animadverti poteſt, Totum hoc genus rerum liberas habet obſervationes, nec diſciplina ulla alia eſt in his melior, gravi prudentiq; Chriſtiano, quam ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit Eccleſiam ad quamcunq; forte devenerit; quod enim neq; contra fidem neq; contra bonos mores injungitur*, Indifferenter *eſt habendum, & pro eorum inter quos vivitur ſocietate ſervandum eſt.* As to thoſe Obſervances which are divers in divers Countries, *that ſome faſt on* Saturday, *others not; ſome communicate every day, others at ſtated times: All ſuch things as theſe are free, and a grave and prudent Chriſtian can follow no better*

Id. ibid.

better rule, than to behave himſelf according to the Order of the Church, to which he ſhall chance to come: For whatſoever is enjoin'd that is not againſt Faith, nor good manners, is to be eſteemed Indifferent, *and to be practiſed according to the Company with which we converſe.* St. *Auſtin* does rightly ſtate the Notion of a thing *Indifferent* (ſuppoſe the *Surplice*) ſomewhat in its own nature not neceſſary, therefore in a Church that does not enjoin it, it may be omitted, ſomewhat in its own nature not Unlawful, therefore in a Church that does enjoin it, it ought to be uſed.

5. *It is no Superſtitious Opinion to believe that the Church may appoint ſignificant Ceremonies.* This is another matter wherein the N. C^ts^. ſpeak big. *It is not true that they have any Authority to appoint ſignificative Ceremonies, where are ſenſible ſigns to affect the Underſtanding, this is to give them Authority to inſtitute*

Sect. 13. *Diſcourſe of Liturgies,* Chap. 16. §. 9.

stitute Sacraments. Another formerly.

Abridg. Lincoln. *See* Burges *Answer Rejoin'd.* Chap. 3. Sect. 1.

All humane Ceremonies being appropriate to Gods service, if they be ordain'd to teach any spiritual duty by their Mystical signification, are unlawful. But such are these Three, the Surplice, *the* Cross *in* Baptism, *and* Kneeling *in receiving the Communion.* Ergo, *they are Unlawful.* There is a clear difference between signs of Grace inwardly infus'd, and signs of duty enjoin'd. It is the nature of a Sacrament to be an outward sign of inward Grace. Wherefore because Christ is the Author of Grace, as it belongs to him whose the deed of Gift is to set to his Seal, so is it the Prerogative of our Lord Christ to institute Sacraments for his Church. But signs of duty are other things, and this distinction is thus expressed by the Learned *Morton.*

See Burges ut supra. Chap. 3. Sec. 4.

There be two acceptions of the word Mystical, one Sacramental by signification of Grace confer'd by God, the other only moral,

ral, ſignifying ſome duty of men to God. The Myſtical Ceremonies condemned by Learned Writers, are Sacramental; all the Ceremonies which we defend, are Myſtical, Moral, not Sacramental.

They who have written of theſe things, have given us divers Inſtances, both out of the Old Teſtament and New, where inſignificant Ceremonies have been allowably practiſed, although they have not been ſtrictly Sacramental, nor of Divine Inſtitution. That which I offer to conſideration, is ſomewhat not fully retorted upon our Adverſaries, that I have any where obſerved, therefore I take liberty to inlarge upon it, when I have firſt mov'd one queſtion. Put the Caſe a *Canon* or Conſtitution of our *Church*, ſhould enjoin the Sexton to make his Graves Eaſt and Weſt, and to take care that they who are buried be laid with their Feet to the Eaſt. I ask, would it be lawful,

lawful, or unlawful, to obey this Constitution? Unlawful? How can that be so, when it is commanded, which is now generally practised, and that without scruple? If lawful, then is a significant Ceremony allowed lawful, for though all men may not think of it, or may not so design, yet there can be no doubt but the Original of that Custom, had a Respect to the Resurrection of the Body, and to an expectation of Christs coming to Judgment, the belief of which was declar'd by this significant Ceremony.

But that which I urge is this. They against whom we argue, contend for *sitting* at the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and that for this reason, because it is a *significant posture.* That it is any where in the *New-Testament* commanded to receive the Sacrament *sitting*, no man in his Wits will say: Yet the *Presbyterians* have

have often argued for it, upon the account of its ſignificancy. So I have heard it out of the Pulpit. *That geſture which ought to be kept above all the reſt, is Sitting, becauſe though it be but a Circumſtance, yet it hath ſome ſignificancy in it, becauſe it is a ſupper geſture. And ſecondly and chiefly, becauſe it ſignifies the familiarity that is between Chriſt and Believers*, Luke 22. 30. *This Supper is a Type of the Everlaſting Supper in Heaven, where one ſhall not ſit and another ſtand.* I name not my Author becauſe he is long ſince dead, but I am certain I do him no wrong. And to make it appear that this is their Doctrine, I add a Printed Teſtimony.

Among the Treatiſes that bear Mr *Bradſhaws* name, one is a *Propoſition concerning Kneeling at the Sacrament*, wherein are theſe words. *Whereas the end of a Sacrament, is to inform the outward man, by ſenſible demonſtra-* Bradſh. *ſeveral Treatiſes.* p. 104.

tions, it pleased our Master to use such a gesture, as agreeably with Bread and Wine, setteth out our Communion and spiritual familiarity with him, and rejoicing in him, and therefore as he says, If any man hear my voice,&c. I will come in to him and sup with him, and he with me: So he says, Many shall come from the East and West, and shall sit with Abraham, &c. *By which place it appears, that as by Supper, so by sitting, familiar rejoicing, or rejoicing familiarity is expressed. Therefore not kneeling but sitting is for receiving.*

It is plain then, that *sitting* is reckon'd a *significant posture.* It is also plain, that it is required in the *Direc. Celebra. Commun.* *Directory. The Table being decently covered, and so conveniently plac'd, that the Communicants may orderly sit about it, or at it,* &c.

I know the pretence is, that they do not Institute a significant Ceremony, they only retain it, as having warrant

warrant from the Example of our Saviour. So ſays the foremention'd Propoſition. *Kneeling is contrary to the Example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who miniſtred and receiv'd ſitting, or in ſuch a geſture as in thoſe Countreys was moſt uſed at eating, from which Example to differ without warrant from Gods word, cannot be without fault, ſeeing the Examples of holy men, much more that of Chriſt, are to be followed except there be ſome reaſonable cauſe to the contrary.* Ibid.

In Anſwer to which I oppoſe three things.

Firſt, If the Example of Chriſt were as they ſay, yet it does no more conclude for our ſitting, than for our receiving at Supper time, &c.

Secondly, They have not the Example of Chriſt, for that manner of ſitting which they now urge.

Thirdly, It is not abſolutely certain, whether they have his Example for any manner of ſitting at all.

Sect. 14. 1. Suppoſe the moſt, that the Apoſtles at the firſt Inſtitution of the Sacrament, did receive it *ſitting*, where is the Argument, becauſe they did, therefore ſo muſt we? Let this be proved. Where is the particular Command that makes it our duty to follow this Example? *Cedo locum* and we yield. That muſt not be ſaid. What then? Will they argue from the Equity of the Example? Let us go on then and ſay, Becauſe of the ſame Example we muſt receive at night, in an upper room, and only Males: For either the whole Example binds in all Circumſtances, or in none; or ſome difference muſt be aſſign'd between this Circumſtance and the other of Time and place, *&c.* And what I pray ſhall that be? Is it becauſe (which is a ſufficient reaſon) they were but Occaſional? there was no deſign in Inſtituting and adminiſtring the Sacrament

crament in ſuch a place, but becauſe it was judg'd by our Bleſſed Saviour a convenient place; Or at night, but becauſe the Paſs-over was firſt to be eaten, and that night our Bleſſed Saviour was to be betrayed, therefore that time of night was moſt proper, becauſe it could not be ſooner or later. Now let it be conſider'd, was it not alſo Occaſional, that they receiv'd it *ſitting*? ſo as their Maſter found them at the Paſs-over (as is now ſuppos'd) ſo being in haſt, he adminiſters this Sacrament. Why therefore ſhould this come into Example rather than the other Circumſtances, unleſs (which can never be proved) there be ſome indications in the Goſpel, that it was the pleaſure of our Lord that this part of his Example ſhould oblige and not the reſt.

Oh! but this geſture ſignifies (as was before ſaid) and does it ſo? Who

can tell that? Who may be bold to say, that the posture which was used upon occasion, was intended for signification, when no such thing is said, only the wits of men have devised this reason, and imagin'd a significancy in it? But be it so. May not then also some signification be fasten'd upon the time and place? It is best to receive in an upper room: this signifies the exalted state to which Believers are receiv'd, and by which they are dignified, whereby also they are rais'd up to a nearness to Heaven in that holy Ordinance. Again, it is best to receive at night: this signifies, after a poor Sinner hath been wearied in his days of sin, as men at night turn to their rest after the labours of the day; so now after the labours of sin, *Return to thy rest, O my Soul, for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee,* Psal. 116. and *Come unto me all ye that labour,* &c.

and

and I will give you reſt, Math. 11. I dare ſay as good Texts to prove receiving at night, as *ſitting* with *Abraham* in the Kingdom of God proves the poſture. Thus is it eaſy to deviſe and imagine; and if this ſhall be thought a worſhipping God after our own devices (as the men who ſeem ſo much to abhor *Superſtition* will be ready to ſay) I ſee not but they who contend ſo much for ſitting, will be guilty, unleſs they can make it appear that the Holy Scripture hath rather recommended one than another. Now if I ſhould repeat thoſe Tragical Declamations againſt *adding to the word of God*, *Will-worſhip*, and *mens devices in the worſhip of God*, of which their writings are full; how would they all fit here? For what is, if this be not worſhipping God after mens Imaginations, when they will make differences where our Bleſſed Saviour hath

made none? And yet this is the beſt that can be ſaid of this Caſe: for this ſuppoſes that Chriſts Example recommends ſitting.

2. Whereas this is farther to be ſaid, They have not ſo much as Example for that manner of ſitting which they now urge: Ἀνέκειτο and ἀνέπεσε, the two words uſed by the *Evangeliſts* upon this occaſion, do not ſignifie ſuch a ſitting as is now in uſe: It is therefore generally agreed, that their poſture was more like to lying than ſitting. So that the beſt of their Argument can be but thus: Becauſe our Bleſſed Saviour gave the Sacrament to his Diſciples in that geſture which they uſed at Meals, which was a kind of lying, therefore we ought to receive it in the geſture now uſed at Meals which is ſitting: where we muſt deſire their Logick to tell us, what degree of neceſſity is in this ſequele, becauſe they did

Matth. 26. Luke 22.

one

one thing, we must do another. Yet neither is this the worst of it, all this is but a supposition of that which they are never able to prove. For

3. It is not absolutely certain, in what posture they did then receive the Lords Supper. Probably they continued in the same posture, but who can peremptorily conclude it? Who can demonstrate to the contrary, but that when our Blessed Saviour, while they were eating, solemnly betook himself to the Institution of a new Sacrament, they to addres themselves to a new service, might betake themselves to a new gesture? I cannot prove they did, nor (for ought I can find) can any body prove they did not. There is nothing conclusive in any of the Evangelists, that they did certainly continue in the same posture; Unless the Order of St. *Luke* be insisted on,

on, who (*Chap.* 22.) after the Institution of the Sacrament hath these words, *But behold the hand of him that betrays me is with me at the Table.* Which Order signifies little to those who will not yield *Judas* to have been at the Sacrament (as divers of our Adversaries will not) but admit he was there, as seems very probable, yet though they were all at the same table as before (and who can demonstrate but it might be another table) yet it does not appear certain, that they were in the same posture as before. This doubt I move, not as a thing in it self considerable, but to represent how strongly some men (and even the same who call so much for Scripture grounds, and for a divine warrant for Circumstances of worship as minute as this) will build upon probabilities, when it serves their turn. Because it is not said they rose up, it is by consequence gather'd they

they ſat ſtill. If they did, it was not our manner of ſitting, but another. If they had ſate as we, yet this Example is no more obligatory, than it is to other Circumſtances of the ſame Inſtitution. Yet through all theſe If's, and Conſequences, and Suppoſitions, they conclude to the expedience, if not to the neceſſity of a *ſignificant Ceremony*, though in us they call it *Superſtition*.

The lifting up the hand at the Covenant, the laying the hand upon the Book in ſwearing and other like Ceremonies, have been objected to them by others, I urge not that, but add another Inſtance whereby it will plainly appear, that many of the N. C^ts^. though they ſuſpect ſo much *ſuperſtition* in a ſignificant Ceremony, yet can themſelves allow and urge the uſe of a Ceremony, and that in a Religious matter, and becauſe it is ſignificant, although the particular

Ceremony

Ceremony be no where in Scripture commanded.

Sect. 15. They who have endeavour'd to settle *Presbyterated* and *Associated Churches*, have determin'd to do it by way of *Covenant*, so consenting to be a Member of such a Church. The Agreement of the Associated Churches in *Worcestershire*, will give us light in this thing; who thus express themselves. *Because Ministers should have a particular knowledge of their Charge, which now is uncertain, and for divers other reasons propounded and debated among us; We judge it very fit, if not of necessity, to desire a more express signification of our peoples consent, to our Ministry and Ministerial actions, and in particular to submit to this discipline, as the members of that particular Church.* Afterwards they tell us in what form of words they require this consent to be given.

Agreement of the Associated Churches in Worcestersh. §. 18.

I do consent to be a Member of the particular Church of Christ at —— whereof —— Teacher, &c.

The reasons why this was required, Mr *Baxter* gives in his Explication of that Agreement, not as his own, but as those that mov'd the *Association* to make that determination. The reasons are Twelve. In all which there is not so much as a pretence of a divine Institution, nay it is confessed in the Preface, *that the sign it self of this consent is not particularly determin'd*; and Mr *Baxter* after the reasons adds this *Memorandum*: *Remember yet that I maintain, that God does in Scripture require, only consent signified* (a thing which I do not now debate) *but hath not tyed us to this or that particular sign, for signifying it, but having given us general Rules, that all things be done to Edification, decently*, &c. *he hath left it to humane prudence to determine of the* Ibid.

the particular sign, whether voice, subscription, &c. So then, such a form of words is own'd to be a sign signifying consent. It is also own'd a sign requir'd only upon General Rules of Scripture. What unpardonable crime is it then, if the *Church of England* agree upon some Ceremonies significant, by virtue of the same general Rules, of Edification and Decency? In which Cases if private men will be so wise as to abound in their own sense, whether or no such things be decent and edifying, the same Mr *Baxter* hath determin'd the Controversy in the same place: where though he assert, that the Pastors are to consult with the people about the convenience; yet he positively concludes: *That people are to obey the determination of their guides.* And how now comes it to pass that the power which they in their times assum'd, should be denied the *Church of England*,

land, *viz.* Power and Authority to appoint significant Ceremonies?

If they will distinguish between Discipline and Worship, and allow a significant Ceremony in that, but not in this, I reply, that in their contentions for Discipline about Mr *Hookers* time, that Axiome of theirs [*Nothing ought to be established in the Church, which is not commanded by the word of God*] was applied to Discipline as well as worship, and therefore *Degrees in the Universities, sundry Church-Offices and Dignities were struck at.* Yea, they did affirm, that the *Discipline was no small part of the Gospel, that without this Discipline there can be no right Religion, that they who reject the Discipline refuse to have Christ reign over them.* However it is clear, A significant Ceremony because allowed in Discipline, is not in the Nature of the thing unlawful. Nor does it deserve the name of a Sacrament properly

Eccles. Pol. Lib. 3. Sect. 5.

Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline. p. 440.

so

so called. Nor does the *Church of England* deserve to be upbraided with *superstition* because of such appointments.

If these grounds be firm and good, I conclude that the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of the *Church of England*, unless they be either burdensome in their Number, or requir'd as somewhat in nature and kind, greater and more necessary than things *Indifferent*, are not faulty or *superstitious*.

Both which Cases deserve Consideration.

Sect. 16. 1. If our Rites be in their nature Innocent, no man hath reason to find fault with their Number. The Compilers of our *Liturgy* have been aware, that an Objection might be here made; And have taken care to prevent the scruple. *Some Ceremonies are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increas'd in these latter days, that the burden of them*

Preface to the Liturgy, of Ceremonies.

was

was intolerable, whereof St. Auſtin *in his time complain'd*, &c. This our *exceſſive multitude was ſo great, and many of them ſo dark, that they did more confound and darken, than declare and ſet forth Chriſts benefits to us.* That Complaint of St. *Auſtin*, is in his Epiſtle to *Januarius*, where he acknowledges. *Quamvis enim neq; hoc inveniri poſſit, quomodo contra fidem ſint; ipſam tamen Religionem, quam, pauciſſimis & manifeſtiſſimis celebrationum ſacramentis, miſericordia Dei eſſe liberam voluit; ſervilibus oneribus premunt, ut tolerabilior ſit conditio Judæorum. Admit that ſuch obſervances be not againſt the Goſpel; yet in as much as the Merciful God would have Religion free from the burden of many Ceremonies; they have ſo clog'd it with burdenſome ſervices, that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable than of Chriſtians now adays.* That there may be no ſuch Cauſe of Complaint among us, the *Church of England* hath been very

Aug. Januario Ep. 119.

moderate in this thing. Not ſo as to eſcape the ill will of her Adverſaries, when they were reſolv'd to find fault; for the Preface to the *Directory* complains of the *many unprofitable and burdenſome Ceremonies, contain'd in the Liturgy, which occaſion'd much miſchief*: yet in cool blood ſome of the party are conſtrain'd to acknowledge *the number of Ceremonies retain'd in our Church, pretending to any legal Authority, but ſmall. The Surplice, and Croſs, and Kneeling at Sacrament are we think all.* And they do us much wrong if they refuſe this acknowledgment. For a great number of obſervations which obtain in the *Church* of *Rome* in the Celebration of the Sacraments (which from their number of *ſeven* we have reduc'd to *Two*) and in other parts of Divine Worſhip, have no place in the *Church of England*, leſt they ſhould divert the minds of men from worſhipping God in ſpirit and truth.

Diſc. of Liturgies, p. 91.

Cere-

Ceremonies harmleſs in themſelves may yet be hurtful in reſpect of their number, therefore hath our Church abrogated a great number of Saints-days and other like Cuſtoms, as Mr *Hooker* hath obſerved. *Eccleſ. Pol.* lib. 4. Sec. 14.

Wherefore ſuch is the preſent ſtate of our Church, that we may ſecurely defy our Adverſaries in this matter, if it were as eaſy to cure their Jealouſies of what may be, as to anſwer their objections againſt what is eſtabliſhed. But here they make difficulty. Though our preſent Number of Ceremonies be but ſmall, yet they raiſe a doubt, how far a Church may go; how many Ceremonies may be eſtabliſh'd, before the number be burdenſome. Where is the *Maximum quod non*, and the *Minimum quod ſic* of ſuperſtition. This is thought a great Argument why no Ceremonies, (beyond what are of direct neceſſity) ſhould be impoſed; becauſe of the *Impoſſibility to fix a point, where the Impoſer* Bagſhaw's *Two great Queries*, p. 10.

poser will stop. For do but once grant that the Magistrate hath power to impose, and then we ly at his mercy how far he will go. And they who allow our present number to be but small, yet think them too many, because, *though there be no more Ceremonies established by law as yet, there are many probationers, and they can see no reason, but the Churches power if allowed to appoint any (save only such, without which the service of God, would apparently to all rational men, be perform'd indecently and disorderly) may appoint Hundreds.* It is also one of Mr *Baxters* reasons, against the Imposing Crossing, and the Surplice, &c. *When we once begin to let in Humane Mystical Rites, we shall never know where to stop, or make an end. On the same ground, that one age invents three or four, the next think they may add as many: and so it will grow to be a point of devotion, to add a new Ceremony (as at* Rome *it hath done) till we have more than we well know what to do with.*

Discourse of Liturgies, p. 91.

Baxter *Disput. of Ch. Government,* p. 477.

I anſwer. The Writings of Moraliſts are not thought defective, though, when they have given General Rules for Temperance, that men may not drink till they diſable their Reaſon, and impair their health, *&c.* they do not deſcend particularly to determine how many Glaſſes a man may drink, and preciſely to ſay, ſuch a draught makes him Intemperate. Nor did Mr *Chillingworth* think, he was wanting to his Adverſary, who counted it *prodigiouſly ſtrange, that Proteſtants could not be induc'd to give in a particular Catalogue of points Fundamental*, when he calls it an *Unreaſonable demand, becauſe variety of Circumſtances makes it impoſſible to ſet down an exact Catalogue of them.* Chillingw. *Religion of Protest. &c.* p. 128, 129.

I think I may have as much reaſon, to reckon it no Imperfection in this diſcourſe, if I do not venture punctually to determine, how great a number of Ceremonies may be re-

quired, before we come at *Superſtition.* When the number becomes ſo great that the ſhadow darkens the ſubſtance: When the ſubſtantial ſervice of God, which ſhould be performed in ſpirit and truth, is prejudic'd by the attendance that is given to the outward Ceremony: when the uſe of the means renders us uncapable to obtain the end; then does it riſe to that exceſſive multitude of which our Church ſpeaks. But becauſe the uſe of our liberty in other lawful things, cannot be fix'd in an Indiviſible point, but alters according to the various Circumſtances of times, and perſons, and conditions, and relations of men; therefore no wiſe man will give one particular determinate rule, which ſhall oblige equally in all Caſes.

In like manner as our Church reckons Ceremonies Indifferent, ſo at the ſame time are they concluded alterable,

alterable, and it is acknowledged, that *upon weighty and important conſiderations, according to the various exigency of times and occaſions, ſuch changes and alterations ſhould be made therein, as to thoſe in place of Authority ſhould from time to time ſeem either neceſſary or expedient.* And here ſure muſt the thing reſt. It muſt be left to the prudence of our Governours. If they ſhall impoſe any thing in which the Conſciences of people are not ſatisfied; If in truth it ſhall be believed that the number of Ceremonies enjoin'd is ſo great, that the means diſſerve the end; that what is ordain'd as an help to Piety and Devotion, does rather hinder it: theſe perſons ſo diſſatisfied about the number, are in the ſame caſe with thoſe who are diſſatisfied about the nature of an Injunction. If they ſcruple without cauſe, and are not duly inform'd, their ſcruples do not render the Injunction unlawful in

Preface to the Liturgy.

it ſelf. Nevertheleſs, the Doctrine of our Church does not encourage them to act againſt their Conſciences, they muſt peaceably ſuffer where they cannot act. No doubt, but it is poſſible Church-Governours (who among us do not pretend to Infallibility) may in ſome things be miſtaken: Yet ſuch things as theſe muſt be left to their determination. For is it not ſo elſewhere? There may be too many Ale-Houſes in a Town, and it may be difficult to determine exactly how many are ſufficient, and where the number will exceed, but is it therefore unlawful for the Juſtices to licence any? There may be in a Countrey, or Town, Pariſhes too many for the Maintenance, or too few for the people, and it may be difficult for Authority to know exactly how many are needful and convenient; Shall there be therefore no diviſion made into ſeveral, for

fear leſt there ſhould be too many or too few? What if there be the ſame difficulty in adjuſting the true number of Ceremonies? yet in as much as it is neceſſary there ſhould be ſome, becauſe elſe Religion in the ſubſtance would ſuffer and decay; therefore is it alſo lawful for our Governours to make a determination in this matter.

The Determination of which number muſt proceed upon the ſame Rules of Decency, Order, and Edification, which give a law to the kind and nature of Ceremonies. And in this General may men reſt ſatisfied till the number ſhall grow doubtful. Then it will concern private perſons to take heed as to their own practice, that the Ceremony do not devour the ſubſtance. But becauſe at preſent there is no reaſonable Cauſe to fear; becauſe the Ceremonies that are now requir'd are ſo few, that no man may with-

without peevishness quarrel at their number, if they be Innocent in their nature and use, therefore I return from this digression to consider that in the next place.

2. The Rites and Ceremonies of our *Church* are not required as things in their nature necessary, but *Indifferent.*

Canon 30. The use of the *Cross* at Baptism is thus accounted for, as being *purg'd from all Popish superstition and error, and reduc'd in the Church of* England *to the primary Institution of it, upon those true Rules of Doctrine concerning things* Indifferent, *which are consonant to the word of God and the Judgment of all Antient Fathers,* &c. And upon the same Rules of Doctrine are our other Ceremonies established. For so the Preface to the *Liturgy* expresses it. *The Ceremonies that remain, are retain'd for a Godly Discipline and Order, which (upon just causes) may be alter'd and chang'd,*

and therefore are not to be esteem'd equal with Gods Law. And the Preface that was made upon the last establishment says. *The particular forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be us'd therein, are things in their own Nature* Indifferent *and alterable, and so acknowledged.* Words too plain to need a Comment, and lyable to no Objection that I can foresee, unless one of these two things shall be replyed both upon them, and all that hath hitherto been said in this matter.

First, That some things are requir'd under the Notion of things *Indifferent*, which are not so.

Secondly, Be it granted that some *Indifferent* things may be impos'd, yet it does not follow that all may, or that the things in controversy may.

We say, the things they scruple are requir'd but as things *Indifferent* as indeed they are. They are not all satisfied to think so of them. The time Sect. 17.

was,

was, when *T. C.* did oppose our Ceremonies, not as *unlawful*, but as *inconvenient*, as hath been already said. And Mr *Ash* in the Epistle to his Funeral Sermon on Mr *Gataker*, when he had named *Cartwright*, and *Hildersham*, and *Dod*, &c. he says of them, *though these men dislik'd the use of superstitious Ceremonies, yet they oppos'd their Tenents and practice, who separated from the* Church of England, *condemning it and the Ministry of it as Antichristian.* The separation is, it seems, now advanc'd, for there are men that reckon there is more *superstition* among us, than was believ'd formerly, and therefore separate farther from us. *It is denied* now *that these are things of Indifferency to be us'd (as is requir'd) in the service of God.* And whereas it is supposed that we say that the Imposition of Rulers makes *Indifferent* things cease to be *Indifferent*, they answer. *They are not Indifferent in the Judgment*

Modest Disc. of Ceremon. p.8.

Petition for Peace, p. 19.

of Diſſenters, though they be ſo in ours. They think they have *probable Arguments to judge it unlawful to Miniſter in a* Surplice, *to ſign with the ſign of the* Croſs *in* Baptiſm, *and to* kneel *in the Act of receiving the Lords Supper.* Yea theſe things are ſo far from being *Indifferent*, that they are thought ſo Unlawful, as that becauſe of them people ſeparate from our Churches. For whatever reaſons may perſwade their Guides not to conform, yet the people ſeparate from us, that they may not partake with our Ceremonies, or for a worſe reaſon. *Exercit. about an Opining Conſci. p. 80.*

I could not altogether omit ſo neceſſary a part of my Diſcourſe, but becauſe it hath been ſo often ſaid, I paſs it in fewer words. *Where no Law is there is no Tranſgreſſion.* That which is not forbid is not Unlawful. Are theſe Rites and Ceremonies forbid in the word of God? By what Text? perhaps by the *ſecond Commandment*, or Rom. 4.

by

by those words of St. *Matth.* *Teachi*
for Doctrine the Commandments of me
Ch. 15. or by the Text *of Will-Wo*
ship, 2 *Colos.* or because *we may not ad*
to, nor diminish from the word of God
Deuteron. 4. Now because the *Sur*
plice, and *Cross*, and *Kneeling*, are no
named in these Texts (as was upon
occasion said before) therefore Con
sequences must be drawn from them
and labour'd so long, till the Conclu
sion must hold as firm as confidence
can make it. Because the *second Com*
mand forbids making and worship
ing graven Images, therefore all de
vices and Inventions of mans brain
must have no place in Divine Wor
ship. *Ergo*, what? *Ergo*, rend the
Surplice, &c. As if the *Bason* at the
Desk were not as much the device o
man as the *Font*, and the *Direct*
were not as obnoxious as the *Ro*
brick.

If our Church did equal her com
mands

mands to the word of God, then were she guilty of adding to the word, and establishing the Commands of men in the room of the Doctrines of God. If any accidents may bring our Rites within the compass of some general prohibitions, the Unlawfulness of them upon that account, will be to be consider'd in what next follows. If they shall be denied *Indifferent* in their own Nature, and yet no one Text of Scripture can be produc'd that speaks one word about them, they who shall so deny, do both bring an Unanswerable prejudice against all the particular establishments, made by the General Rules of prudence, whether by the *Presbyterians* or *Independents*, and do also quite mistake the nature of a thing *Indifferent*.

If we descend to particular Instances, I desire to know, why the *Surplice* is not as Indifferent as a *Gown* or *Cloak*.

Cloak. Not because it is a white Garment, for then why are not Bands Unlawful? And where is the Text that forbids white more than black? Nor because it is of such a fashion; for the Scripture gives no more directions for the shaping of a *Cloak* than a *Surplice.* Why then? Surely either because it is thought *decent* or *significant*, or because it is *appropriated to divine worship.*

1. If it be *decent*, then is it no Errour to think it so; then the Apostolical *Canon, let all things be done decently*, justifies and maintains it. And is it not decent? Does nature teach so,
1 Cor. 11. to whom St. *Paul* appeals? We do not find any inbred shame, as if we did somewhat Unnatural in the use of it. Does *Scripture* pronounce it uncomely? We cannot find it. There is no other Rule for Decency, but either common estimation, or the pleasure of our Governours; for the latter

latter we are ſecure, and ſet peeviſhneſs aſide, fear not being condemn'd by the former.

2. Peradventure it is thought *ſignificant*, therefore not *Indifferent*. I anſwer: that a *ſignificant Ceremony* (if this ſhould be ſuch) only as ſuch, *is not ſuperſtitious*. But who told our men of ſcruples, that it is urg'd as ſignificant of Candor and Purity? By what *Canon* or *Rubrick* is any man oblig'd to have ſuch an Opinion of it? Whatever others, who may have a better Opinion of ſignificant Ceremonies, may think of it, he who is ſatisfied to wear it as a decent Garment, tranſgreſſes no Law, if he think no more.

3. Is it unlawful and not *Indifferent*, becauſe it is *appropriated to Divine Service*? This it ſeems is Dr *Collings ſcruple*, who thinks it *Unlawful to wear any habit peculiarly appropriated to the worſhip of God*. I wonder then how it *Exercit. of Opin. Conſc. p.* 80.

can be lawful to lean on a Pulpit Cushion, or to use a Communion Cup, if the Church-Wardens should be so *superstitious* as to lock them up and preserve them from all other uses. If there be any thing in Scripture that forbids the use of a Garment upon any of these accounts, somewhat will be offer'd worth considering, till then, we continue to believe it *Indifferent* and free from *superstition.*

2. Why is not *Kneeling, &c. Indifferent?* not because it is a *posture,* for so is *sitting,* but because it is such a posture. And what is it? A posture us'd upon any *superstitious Opinion?* Let us know what that is. Is it suspected to signifie our Adoration of the Elements? The *Declaration* of our *Liturgy* delivers us from that suspicion, and authorizes us to reckon them pitifully Ignorant, or monstrously Uncharitable, who after so plain a Decla-

Declaration will ſuſpect it. What it ſignifies we there read. *This Order is well meant for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Chriſt, and for the avoiding of prophanation and diſorder.* If it be unlawful to ſignify humility and thankfulneſs, why do we at any time kneel or lift up our hands and eyes to Heaven? Or if it be unlawful to avoid prophanation and diſorder, then let St. *Paul* be reproved for ſetting things in Order in the Church of *Corinth*. Till I can find ſome Text that forbids Kneeling, or till I can be ſatisfied that ſome *ſuperſtitious* Opinion gives occaſion to it, I muſt continue to reckon this alſo *Indifferent*.

Order for Adminiſ. of H. commun.

1 Cor. 11.

3. And to the ſame purpoſe I ſay of the *Croſs* at *Baptiſm*. How *ſuperſtitiouſly* the *Papiſts* uſe it, I ſhall have occaſion to ſay, but our uſe of it being no where in Scripture forbid, unleſs it can be proved, that our 30*th*

Canon (of which before) gives a falſe Account of it, unleſs there be ſome *Popiſh* (or other) *ſuperſtition* or error from which it is not ſufficiently purg'd, it remains in its nature *Indifferent*. Our general Anſwer in all is, as before, *Where no Law is, there is no Tranſgreſſion. What is not forbid, is allowed, is not Unlawful.*

Sect. 18. 2. There may be ſome who will grant that ſome *Indifferent* things may be Impos'd, yet will not yield that our Ceremonies therefore may, becauſe of ſome objections againſt them, which have not equal force againſt all matters *Indifferent*. Such are theſe two thought to be.

1. The caſe of Scandal and giveing offence to weak Brethren.

2. Becauſe they have been abus'd among the Papiſts.

I ſhould be aſham'd to mention theſe things wherein the N. C^ts^. have been ſo often anſwer'd, did I not conſider,

ſider, that till this be clear'd, the prejudice which I deſire to remove will ſtill remain; for if for theſe reaſons Conformity be Unlawful, then may it ſeem, that they who either impoſe or practiſe it, have an undue opinion of that which is ſo unlawful, and that opinion ſhall be ſuſpected of *ſuperſtition*. I proceed therefore to ſay, If they who impoſe theſe Rites, did not in truth judge them expedient and decent in the worſhip of God, only becauſe they think them barely lawful, they urge them as believing many ſcrupulous minds will be offended at them, and therefore they lay them as Snares, and take advantage to incommode and bring under a penalty, thoſe who ſcruple them; this might be called *Tyranny*, but not properly *ſuperſtition*, and ſo would not reach our Caſe. I make not this ſuppoſition as if I would tempt any diſſatisfied man ſo

to judge of them, for aſſuredly it is no leſs than a blaſpheming of Dignities, to think they enact Conformity for this reaſon. But I find they who pretend to be diſſatisfied will thus ſuſpect. And Mr *Bagſhaw* thus expreſſes it, *Whoever obtrudes his conceits upon others, who perhaps are not ſo well ſatisfied as he is; becomes impious to God, by invading his ſovereignty, and lording it over another mans Conſcience; and likewiſe injurious to men, by preſſing ſuch things as are only baits to the careleſs, and traps for the Conſcientious.* Unleſs there be more hypocriſy than *ſuperſtition* in our Governours, this cannot be the caſe, for they profeſs to have done that *which to their beſt underſtandings they conceiv'd might moſt tend to the preſervation of peace and unity in the Church, the procuring of Reverence, and exciting of Devotion, in the publick worſhip of God, and the cutting off occaſion from them that ſeek occaſion of cavil or quarrel*

Two great Queries concerning things Indiff. p. 11.

Preface to the Liturgy.

quarrel againſt the Liturgy of the Church. They have then impoſed nothing, but what they judg'd not only lawful, but expedient; which Impoſitions being already prov'd *Indifferent*, unleſs the Circumſtances that attend them render them ſuch, may not be judg'd *ſuperſtitious*.

It is therefore to be conſider'd, whether either of the two ſuſpicions now mention'd, be reaſon enough to charge our way of worſhip as *ſuperſtitious*.

1. Suppoſe the Governours of the Church do not err in eſteeming theſe things in their own nature *Indifferent*, yet ſay *Diſſenters*, in as much as they are offenſive to many Godly and Conſcientious men, they ought not to be impos'd; or if they be, it will be doubtful, whether the great opinion they have of ſuch matters, as to enjoin them notwithſtanding their offenſiveneſs, be not a *ſuperſtitious* Opinion.

I anſwer. If the Act for Uniformity ſhould contradict thoſe Precepts of the Goſpel, that oblige us not to *lay ſtumbling-blocks*, nor *give offence to our weak Brother*; in as much as *giving offence* and not *walking charitably* are the ſame thing, this procedure would be a treſpaſs againſt the ſecond Table, rather than the Firſt, would be *uncharitableneſs* rather than *ſuperſtition*. It will be replyed. Though directly it be an offence againſt our Neighbour, yet reductively it is againſt the Firſt Table, becauſe ſuch a practice is declarative of ſome undue and *ſuperſtitious* Opinions of thoſe things which are ſo impos'd. Let it be added therefore. So long as private perſons are not determin'd by the Laws of their Superiors, it concerns them warily to uſe their liberty, to take heed that their doing that which is lawful, may not tempt others to do the ſame thing, while they

they judge it unlawful, which is the offending of our Brother, of which St. *Paul* ſpeaks to the *Romans* and *Corinthians*, who only diſcourſes of what ought to be done in thoſe Caſes, where no lawful power had interpos'd, to determine them one way or other. For eating fleſh and letting it alone were both lawful, and remain'd *Indifferent* in nature and uſe too: Now ſo long as the caſe remains thus, the Law of not ſcandalizing a weak Brother is a Moral Law, becauſe it is an inſtance of the great Law of *loving our Neighbour as our ſelves*, and *doing to others as we would have them do to us*, wherefore ſo far as it is practicable it obliges. But this may not be extended to diſoblige the ſubject from obeying his ſuperiours in lawful things, nor to diſable the Magiſtrate from making laws in things *Indifferent*.

Firſt, it does not diſoblige the ſubject,

ject, because the law of obedience to our Superiors being also a Moral Law, either we are at the same time oblig'd by two laws which contradict, or one must yield to the other. If wearing the *Surplice* offend, I must either disobey the Magistrate, or offend my Brother. Which then of these two must give place? According to the N. C^ts^. we must relinquish a certain Rule for that which is uncertain. What the Magistrate commands is certain, it is also certain, that I am in my Conscience resolv'd of the lawfulness of that which is so Commanded (taking it abstractly from its offensiveness) If I must now demur in my obedience lest I give offence, how shall I certainly know whether I offend or no? how shall I know how many I may offend? What assurance shall I have but my Non-Conformity may offend as many on the other side? I shall now

proceed

proceed by an uncertain Rule, because I know not whither it will carry me, and I am in a Case wherein one Moral Law must give place to another. Whereas upon our Principles things are fairly reconcileable. In matters undetermin'd by Law, where we are at our liberty, we must walk charitably and take heed that we give no offence, that our *liberty become not a stumbling-block*, this is the Moral Law, and this is Gospel. But there is no Precept of the Gospel that commands us to disobey our Superiors lawful commands for an uncertain danger of giving offence. Wherefore when we practise Conformity in obedience to establish'd Laws, although peradventure we should offend our weak Brother, yet do we not thereby declare a *superstitious* Opinion of the Ceremonies we use. We may think our selves oblig'd to obey our Governours

1 Cor. 8. 9.

vernours in all lawful things, and yet not think of the *Surplice* or *Cross*, *&c. more highly than we ought to think.*

2. And as it does not disoblige the subject from Obedience, so neither may it be thought to disable the Magistrate from making laws about things *Indifferent*. For if it did, it were not safe to make any laws about *Decency* and *Order*, because the Magistrate can never be secure, but his Determinations may be so cross to the opinions of some of his subjects, as to make them *offend* if they obey. But it hath been already evinc'd, that the N. C^ts^. yield the Magistrate a power to proceed according to the Rules of Christian Prudence in governing the Church: And the frame of the *Directory*, and the urging of the *Covenant* do sufficiently assure us, that the hazard of *scandalizing a weak Brother*, was no restraint to an Ordinance

nance of the *Lords and Commons*. He who in his Conſcience thought there was no way of worſhip ſo Regular as that of the *Church of England*: He who thought he ſhould ſin if he ſhould conform to the *Directory*, was not thereby excus'd from *ſequeſtration*. Yet I dare ſay, they would take it ill, if they ſhould be ſuſpected of *ſuperſtition*, of having an undue opinion of their manner of Divine Service. And I cannot yet ſee why they, commanding men to receive the Sacrament *ſitting*, when probably that would tempt ſome men not to receive it at all, did not as much *offend their Brother*, and did not as much declare that they had a *ſuperſtitious* opinion of ſuch *ſitting*, as the commands that now require *Kneeling* may be ſo interpreted.

2. Nor does the ſecond ſcruple weigh much. Our Ceremonies are ſuppos'd to have been abus'd among the

the *Papiſts*, and this is made a great Argument by the N. C^ts. why they ſhould not be retain'd. To this the Anſwer hath been ſo often given to this purpoſe, that by the ſame reaſon our Churches may not be now us'd, nor our Bells which have been Chriſten'd, nor any thing retain'd that relates to Divine Worſhip, but what is of abſolute neceſſity, and is particularly commanded; that I dwell not here any farther than, according to my former Method, to give a Teſtimony how little this objection ſignifies when it is made againſt them.

It had been laid to *T. C*'s. charge, that he ſhould thus declaim againſt the *Church of England*. The *Communion Book was taken out of the Maſs-Book, that it were better to conform our ſelves in outward things to the Turks than to the Papiſts. Whatſoever comes from the Pope which is Antichriſt, comes firſt from the Devil,*

Survey of the H. pretended Diſcipl. p. 315, 316.

Devil, &c. In the time of this Raillery it did chance to be laid to his charge, that their *Disciplinarian* way did smell of *Donatism* and *Anabaptism*, and was a kind of *Papism*. Now what defence does he make? *If amongst the filth of their Heresies* (viz. *the* Papists, Donatists, *and* Anabaptists) *there may be found any good thing* (*as it were a grain of good Corn in a great deal of Darnel*) *that we willingly receive, not as theirs, but as the Jews did the Holy Ark from the Philistins, whereof they were unjust Owners. Yea it may come to pass that the Synagogue of Satan may at some time have some one thing with more convenience than the Catholick Church of Christ.*

Our *Liturgy* is indeed taken from them, but as gold is purg'd from dross. And there are divers things wherein we agree with them, because it is no crime to agree with them there, where they do not disagree with the word of God: And because

because it is not hard to believe that running into a contrary extream, that an Aversation from what is Innocent among them, does harden them in their Errors as much, yea a great deal more, than a retaining some Customs which may honestly be retain'd. If we do not symbolize with them in the *superstition* of their Rites, there is no reason we should be charg'd with *superstition*, because we do not run a madding from them as far as we are able into another extream.

This is that I had to say to the second general Proposition (which hath exceeded the proportion of the other, because it was my chief design.) *The Doctrines upon which the Conformity of the Church of England is established, are not superstitious Opinions.*

Sect. 19. 3. *The Opinions that are superstitious, such as are divers which obtain in the Church of* Rome *and elsewhere, are rejected*

jected by the Church of England. There are many differences between us and the *Church* of *Rome*, and they are not all reducible to this Topick of *superstition*. There are Doctrines among them of other denominations, because they serve some secular Interest of profit, or pleasure, or honour; so is it easy to evince, that the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, and *Celibacy of Priests*, and others are Doctrines of men who reckon *gain* their *Godliness*. The Doctrine of *Indulgences* and *Dispensations*, &c. does not only design profit, but together with other loose Doctrines of *Morality*, makes a very easie way to Heaven, and so is sensual and pleasurable. And the *Supremacy* of the *Pope* and exemption of *Ecclesiasticks* from secular Jurisdiction, is a Doctrine of Mundane greatness and unsufferable Ambition. There may be a mixture of *superstition* in all or any of these, according as mens appre-

henſions are concerning them. But there are other matters, wherein I give account of their *ſuperſtition.* Biſhop *Morton* hath comprehended this in three generals, wherein he does at the ſame time vindicate the *Church of England*, and condemn that of *Rome.*

Preſentment of a Schiſmatick. p. 14.

Our Church in her Service-Book does make known to all the World, that ſhe does deteſt the ſuperſtition of the Romiſh Ceremonies, by condemning their ſuperſtitious Opinions. Firſt, *In making them neceſſary parts of Gods Worſhip.* Secondly, *In aſcribing an efficacious ſanctity to them.* Thirdly, *By arrogating a meritorious condignity from them to themſelves.* I need not reſtrain my diſcourſe to Ceremonies only, be it in Ceremony or be it in ſubſtance; If I make it appear that they eſteem that a neceſſary part of Gods worſhip which ought not to be ſo eſteem'd, (and ſo for the other two) I ſhall conclude right when I charge them with *ſuperſtition.* An

An Enumeration of particulars will be the beſt evidence in this matter. I therefore give Inſtances to ſhow that for theſe ſeveral reaſons the *Church* of *Rome* is guided by *ſuperſtitious Opinions* to *ſuperſtitious practices*, by which it will alſo appear that the *Church of England* does renounce thoſe practices, at leaſt if for other reaſons ſome of them be retain'd, yet the Opinion which is the original of their practice is diſowned by us.

1. That opinion is *ſuperſtitious* whereby men judge and eſteem any uſages in Religion neceſſary when they are not ſo, or more neceſſary than indeed they are. When men advance any thing in the worſhip of God beyond its nature, judging that to be holy, and to have a relation to God which hath none, or to have a nearer relation than in truth it hath. *Pius* IV. in a *Creed* which he impos'd, furniſhes us with ſufficient Inſtances. Onuphrius in Vit. Pii 4. p. (mihi) 384.

When he had by his *Diploma* allow'd and confirm'd all that was done at the *Council of Trent*; he proceeded to direct in what manner Biſhops ſhould be made.

Then it follows. *Hanc Fidei formulam quam Epiſcopi deſignati profiterentur inſtituit.* He appointed a *certain Creed which all that were to be made Biſhops ſhould make profeſſion of.* In the Concluſion of which Creed are theſe words. *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt ſponte profiteor,* &c. *This true Catholick Faith, out of which no man can be ſaved, I willingly profeſs.* Now among the *Credenda*, which he reckons, and obliges others to reckon neceſſary to Salvation, are ſuch as theſe. That there are *ſeven Sacraments* of the *New-Teſtament properly ſo called, inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt.* The *propitiatory Sacrifice of the Maſs, Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, worſhipping Relique*

liques and Images; and leſt enough ſhould not be crowded into that Creed, it is added. *Cætera item omnia à ſacroſanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo tradita, definita & declarata indubitanter recipio atq; profiteor.* All that was determin'd at the *Council of Trent* is to be receiv'd without ſcruple. This is the Faith without which (they ſay) no man can be ſaved.

How theſe Opinions are rejected by our Church is too plain to need proof. It reſt to ſay, however otherwiſe faulty and dangerous they are, this makes them *ſuperſtitious*, that they are made neceſſary, whereas indeed they are falſe. I mean not every thing eſtabliſhed by that *Council* of *Trent*, but the Articles before-named, and divers other like things decreed in that Council.

If the Intendment of this Eſſay were principally againſt the Church of *Rome*, it would the leſs be an ex-

cursion, if the things now mention'd were severally consider'd, and their repugnancy to Scripture shown; but being design'd rather for the Vindication of the *Church of England*, and that for the sake of those who agree with us in rejecting these Doctrines, I am not willing to engage in all these Controversies. I think it sufficient to add another instance under this Head, and so convict them together of *superstition*.

Histor. Concil. Trident. Sess. 4.

The *Council* of *Trent* does advance *Unwritten Traditions* to an Authority *equal with the word of God*. When the question is mov'd what are these Unwritten Traditions, their Authors distinguish between such as are *Divine*, *Apostolical*, and *Ecclesiastical*. Those which they call Divine are in the Account of *Azorius*, such as these. *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation*, *Invocation of Saints*, *worshipping Images*, *Communion in one kind enough for Laicks*, &c. Whereas the

Azor. Institut. Moral. Part. 1. lib. 8. Cap. 4.

the queſtion may be again ask'd, how ſhall we know that theſe are Divine Traditions after ſome other Rules, *Bellarmine* wholly reſts it upon the Teſtimony of the *Romiſh Church*. *Ex Teſtimonio hujus ſolius Eccleſiæ ſumi poteſt Certum Argumentum ad probandum Apoſtolicas Traditiones.* From the *Teſtimony of the alone Church of* Rome *may a man have a certain Argument to prove Apoſtolical Traditions.* Which rule I ſuppoſe he intends for the aſſuring us of *Divine Traditions* too: for ſo he had before join'd them. *Aſſerimus in ſcripturis non contineri expreſſè Totam Doctrinam neceſſariam, ſive de fide ſive de moribus, & proinde præter verbum Dei ſcriptum requiri etiam verbum Dei non ſcriptum*, i. e. *Divinas & Apoſtolicas Traditiones. We aſſert that the ſcripture does not contain all neceſſary Doctrine, whether about Faith or manners, there is therefore moreover requir'd, Divine and Apoſtolical Tradition.*

Bellarm. De Verbo Dei non ſcripto. Cap. 9.

Id. ibid. Cap. 3.

From these premises I argue to the *superstition* of the *Church* of *Rome*. Because they practise in their Sacraments and elsewhere upon *superstitious opinions*. The Devotion of the Jews is thus challeng'd, *Their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men.* The Messages which God Almighty sent them by his Prophets, were not the Rule of their worship, but the Traditions of men were instead of the word of God. And this was their *Indebitus cultus*, their *superstition*: This Text the *Septuagint* translate, μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με. *In vain do they worship me, teaching the commands of men and Doctrins.* St. *Matthew* hath alter'd the site of one word, and there we read in application to the Pharisees. *In vain do they worship me teaching for Doctrines the Commands of men.* The case to which this quotation is there applyed, is their making the Fifth Commandment of none effect by their

Isai. 29.

Matth. 15.

Tra-

Tradition. That which God had made neceſſary by his Command [*Honour thy Father and Mother*] with that they diſpens'd. That which God had not made neceſſary by any expreſs Declaration of his pleaſure, that was made neceſſary by their Tradition. And this was their *ſuperſtition*.

To which the caſe of the *Church* of *Rome* is but too parallel. They make the *ſecond Command* of none effect by their *Tradition* of *worſhipping Images*. In other things they make that neceſſary which the written word of God hath not made ſo. Some of which Traditions if they be not directly contrary to the word of God, yet becauſe they are arrogantly equalled, and commanded to be received *Pari pietatis affectu & reverentiâ*; the practices that flow from theſe Doctrines cannot be excus'd from *ſuperſtition*, as we now uſe the word

(and

(and as they, as well as we, define the thing) for an excess in Religion, whereby men worship God, after such a manner as they ought not.

Sect. 20. 2. The second Account of their *superstition* is, that they ascribe an *Efficacious sanctity to their Ceremonies*. Here also Instances will make it plain, both that they are thus chargeable, and that the *Church of England* does reject these Opinions.

The Doctrine of *Rome* is, that the *Cross* is to be worshipped with the *highest kind of worship*. *Crux Christi in quâ Christus Crucifixus est, tum propter repræsentationem, tum propter membrorum Christi contactum Latriâ adoranda est. Crucis vero Effigies in aliâ quâvis materiâ priori tantum ratione Latriâ adoranda est. The Cross whereon Christ was Crucified is to be worshipped with* Latriâ, *both because of its representation, and because of its touching the Body of Christ. But the sign of the Cross elsewhere, is to be worshipped*

Aquin. tertia Pars qu. 25. Artic. 4.

ſhipped only for the former reaſon, (which laſt words were well put in, for it would be a wonder indeed, if the ſign of the Croſs made at *Rome*, ſhould deſerve worſhip *propter Contactum.*) This we contend is *ſuperſtitious*, becauſe the Opinions they have of the Croſs are ſuch. For they aſcribe ſuch Effects to the Croſs, which neither the word of God aſcribes to it, nor any mans reaſon without the help of feigned Miracles, or Traditions (before accounted for) would expect from it. Take it in *Bellarmin's* words. 1° *Tres ſunt Effectus Crucis mirabiles. Terret & fugat Dæmones*: 2° *pellit morbos & omnia mala*: 3° *Sanctificat ea quibus imprimitur.* There are *Three wonderful effects of the Croſs. Firſt, It frights and ſcares away the Devil. Secondly, It drives away Diſeaſes and all Evils. Thirdly, It ſanctifies thoſe things upon which it is made.* The firſt of theſe effects he aſcribes to it for

Bell. de Imagin. Sanctorum lib. 2. Cap. 30.

Three

Ibid. Three Causes. *Ex apprehensione Dæmonis, ex Devotione hominis, ex Instituto Dei.* From *the apprehension of the Devil,* from the *Devotion of man*, from the *Institution of God.* So that they suppose the appointment of God hath empowr'd the *Cross* to scare the Devil. The power of sanctifying that upon which the sign of the Cross is made, he makes parallel with the power Ibid. which he supposes in Reliques. *Sanctificantur aliquo modo ii qui tangunt Reliquias*, which he hath the confidence to assert upon the Authority of the Fathers.

Our 30th *Canon* (as hath been said) rejects these *superstitions and errors.* Which *superstition* we therefore lay to their charge, because they ascribe an effect to a certain Cause, without a sufficient warrant. That the sign of the Cross hath not naturally in it self any power of sanctifying or curing, *Bellarmine* can't but acknowledge.

Signum

Signum Crucis operatur mirabilia non ex virtute ſuâ naturali quam habet ut figura quædam, ſed ut ſignum divinitus Inſtitutum. The ſign of the Croſs works wonders, not as a certain figure, by any natural virtue, but as a ſign appointed of God. Id. ibid. Here is then *ſuperſtition*, to eſteem the ſign of the Croſs more holy than indeed it is, to believe it to have ſuch a relation to God, which it can't be prov'd to have, to aſcribe to it a virtue which no ſyllable in the H. Scripture declares to us. And who hath known the mind of God any farther than he hath been pleas'd to reveal it to us?

Eſtius makes a little attempt to deliver ſuch like Ceremonies as this is from *ſuperſtition. Si debito decentiq; modo exſpectetur effectus aliquis à Deo, etiamſi naturali virtute haberi non poteſt, nulla eſt ſuperſtitio. If the effect be expected in a due and decent manner, though the cauſe cannot by any natural virtue produce* Eſtius in ſentent. Tom. 3. Diſtinc. 37. Sec. 8.

produce it, it is no superstition. So, he says, the Church does consecrate *Salt* and *Holy-Water*, &c. because

Matth. 10. Luke 10. *Christ gave his Apostles power over unclean Spirits, and power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions*, &c. which power he supposes still to reside in the Church. As *Elisha* cur'd the waters with *salt*, as *Christ* cur'd blind Eyes with *clay* and *spittle*, in like manner, *potestas exorcizandi Dæmones à Christo Apostolis tradita usq; in hodiernum diem in Ecclesiâ permansit. The power of casting out Devils committed by Christ to his Apostles remains in the Church to this day.* If we will take Forgeries and cheats for real miracles, the thing is proved. But if we should be a little scrupulous, and require better proof of matter of fact, and till that be given, should doubt whether the Apostles power of working Miracles be transmitted to this age, we are then at a great loss to solve the *Phænomenon*, and to clear the use of the

the *Croſs* and *holy water*, &c. from *ſuperſtition*. Whereas it is confeſſed, that the natural virtue of theſe Ceremonies can't produce ſuch effects, it is alſo as plain, ſo far as the Word of God is our guide, that we have no ſufficient warrant to expect theſe preternatural and extraordinary Events, becauſe there is no divine promiſe annex'd to the uſe of theſe things.

Of the ſame nature is that Doctrine that the Sacraments confer Grace, *Ex opere Operato*. The *Council of Trent* anathematizes them who ſay, *per Sacramenta non conferri gratiam virtute miniſtrationis eorum, ſive ex opere operato*. That the *Sacraments do not confer grace by virtue of the very adminiſtration of them, or by the deed done*. So *Bellarmine* begins his ſecond Book, *De effectu Sacramentorum*, with this enquiry. *An ſacramenta novæ legis ſint veræ Cauſæ juſtificationis ex opere operato*. Whether *the Sacraments of the Goſpel be true cauſes*

Hiſtor. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 7.

ſes of Juſtification by virtue of the deed done. That they are ſo, and that they are thereby diſtinguiſhed from the Sacraments of the old Law, he offers to prove in the proceſs of that Book. In which though it be true, that he ſpeaks of Faith and Repentance as diſpoſitions in the ſubject, to mollify the Opinion, yet there is no doubt but their Opinion is, that the Sacraments confer grace, however indiſpos'd the ſubject be. Which appears by the abſolutions that are given upon Confeſſion, even there, where no Contrition ſhows it ſelf. According to the *Jeſuit's* Doctrine, *they ought not to be deny'd or delay'd abſolution, who continue in habitual ſins, againſt the laws of God, and nature, and the Church, though they diſcover not the leaſt hope of amendment.* And *Valentia* determins *that Contrition is not requiſite at all in order to obtain the principal effect of the Sacrament, nay on the contrary it is rather*

Myſt. Jeſuitiſ. Letter 10. p. 145. 150. T. Bauny. Ibid.

rather obſtructive. Yea *Bellarmine* himſelf elſewhere diſtinguiſhes between *opus operatum*, and *opus operantis*. When men pray for help againſt Diſeaſes, the effect does not infallibly follow, for this reaſon, *quia tunc effectus non producitur ex opere operato, more Sacramentorum, ſed ex opere operantis.* Becauſe it is not produc'd *by the deed done, as in the Sacraments, but ſuppoſes the diſpoſition of the doer.* What they thus attribute to the *Sacraments*, *Azorius* extends to *ſacramentals* (though he confeſſes ſome Romaniſts are againſt him) he affirms that the very ſprinkling with *Holy-Water* without conſideration of the act of Repentance, does away venial ſins.

Bellarm. de Imagin. Sanctorum lib. 2. Cap. 30.

Inſtitut. Moral. Part. 1. lib. 4. Cap. 11.

How much our *Church* aſcribes to Sacraments, is plain. *They are ſure witneſſes and effectual ſigns of Gods Grace and good will towards us, by which he does work inviſibly in us.* But in the ſame Article it is declar'd againſt the *Opus*

Artic. 25.

Operatum, for *in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation.*

The dangerous Consequences of this their Doctrine, especially as their late Casuists have improv'd it, I now exaggerate not. All that I would conclude hence is, that their worship of God in the Sacraments, because it is built upon this opinion, is *superstitious*. God alone is the fountain of Grace, he conveys it into the hearts of men as he pleases: But no man hath reason to expect it by any other means than what God hath promised to bless. The Sacraments are of excellent use: But there is no promise extant that the bare receiveing the *Eucharist*, whatever the disposition or indisposition of the Receiver be, shall produce this effect (and it is conferring grace *in Adultis*, that is now to be consider'd.) Nay, we are assur'd that he who *eats and drinks*

drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself. Wherefore he who promises to himself, that which God hath not promis'd, he who expects grace upon these terms, who receives the Sacrament upon an Opinion, that the deed done (however it be done) will bring him into a state of grace, is *superstitious* in so thinking and so doing.

The Doctrine of *Merit* is another *superstitious Opinion.* If *Bellarmine* understood it, this it is. *Opera bona Justorum meritoria sunt vitæ æternæ ex condigno, non solum ratione pacti & acceptationis, sed etiam ratione operis. The good works of just men do merit life eternal of condignity, not only because of the Covenant of grace, but also from the nature of the works themselves.* Moreover beyond the bare *merit* of good works, he affirms, that as a man may merit a reward to himself, so he may make satisfaction for the release and

Sect. 21. Bellarm. de Justificat. lib. 5. Cap. 17.

discharge of another. And this is the foundation of their doctrine of *Indulgences. Extat Thesaurus aliquis in Ecclesiâ qui sit Indulgentiarum Fundamentum.* For the making good of which he thus argues and proceeds.

Bellarm. de Indulgent. lib. 1. Cap. 2.

Prima Propositio. In bonis actionibus hominum Justorum duplex valor sive pretium assignari potest, meriti, viz. *& satisfactionis.*

Secunda Propos. Opus bonum quâ parte meritorium est, non potest alii applicari, potest tamen quâ satisfactorium.

Tertia Propos. Extat in Ecclesiâ Thesaurus satisfactionum ex Christi passionibus infinitus, qui nunquam exhauriri poterit.

Quarta Propos. Ad hunc Thesaurum superfluentium satisfactionum pertinent etiam passiones B. Mariæ Virginis, & omnium aliorum sanctorum qui plus passi sunt quam eorum peccata requirerent.

That is in short. *Together with the infinite value of the satisfactory sufferings of*

of our Saviour, The ſufferings of the B. Virgin Mary *and all other Saints, who have ſuffer'd more than their ſins requir'd, are to be join'd, by which as they have merited to themſelves, ſo have they ſatisfied for others.*

How much this diſhonours the Undertakings of our B. Saviour, and for what other reaſons we explode the Doctrine of *Merit*, and the appendage of *ſatisfaction*, and *Indulgences*, I have not now to ſay. The *ſuperſtition* of theſe Opinions is now to be conſider'd.

Bellarmin's Controverſies would not have deſerv'd the Character given them by *Albertus Hungerus*, in his approbation prefix'd to the *Firſt Tome*, viz. *Integerrimum, pulcherrimum abſolutiſſimumq; Controverſiarum omnium corpus*, A moſt *Entire and Compleat body of Controverſies*; if he had balk't any of the Doctrines currant at *Rome*. So he muſt write when he

pleads for a party; but I think it no very difficult task, to find ſome acknowledgments, even in thoſe ſame Books of Controverſies, which would greatly weaken moſt of the things in difference between us, which he would eſtabliſh. In this of *Merit*, who hath not heard of that famous reſolution of his: *Propter incertitudinem propriæ Juſtitiæ & periculum inanis gloriæ, Tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in ſolâ Dei miſericordiâ & benignitate reponere.* Becauſe of the *Uncertainty of our own righteouſneſs, and the danger of vain glory, It is moſt ſafe to put our whole confidence only in the mercy and goodneſs of God.*

Bellarm. de Juſtificat. lib. 5. Cap. 7.

——— *Si ſic*
Omnia dixiſſet ———

How well does this agree with what we ſay in our Office of the *H. Communion! We do not preſume to come*

to

to this thy Table, O Merciful Lord, truſting in our own righteouſneſs, but in thy manifold and great Mercies, &c. And with our 12 *Article. Good works which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Juſtification, cannot put away our ſins, and endure the ſeverity of Gods Judgment.* We will join againſt the *Antinomians*, and with great zeal aſſert the *neceſſity* of good works, if the *merit* of them may be excluded, but that we can't but charge with *ſuperſtition*.

He who gives Alms, *&c.* does a good work acceptable to God by Jeſus Chriſt; but he who opines, he thereby merits the favour of God (any otherwiſe than becauſe God has promis'd to accept ſuch ſervices) He who apprehends ſuch a worthineſs in what he does, as that for its own ſake he may expect to receive ſome reward, becauſe there is ſome proportion and equality in it, *ad præmium vitæ æternæ*, as *Bellarmine*

ſpeaks: He who deſigns to oblige Almighty God by his good works; hath a proud conceit of himſelf, who when he hath done all he can, *is but an Unprofitable ſervant*; and he has a falſe and undue Opinion of God, to think a man may be profitable to God, as men may be one to another. Therefore are theſe ſervices *ſuperſtitious*, becauſe they are perform'd upon falſe and undue Opinions, and he who thus worſhips God, does that which is not requir'd at his hands.

If theſe things wanted evidence, I might add their works of *ſupererogation*, their *Auſterities and penances*, ſo far as they apprehend a Merit *in Opere Operato*. Alſo other things might have a place in this Argument, and might range by themſelves, if they be not reducible to any of Biſhop *Mortons* general heads. Such as are, *Their publick Prayers in the Church, in a Tongue not underſtood of the people.* Their requiring

requiring and uſing ſuch a vaſt number of Ceremonies, which by their great exceſs and multitude become a burden intolerable (as the Preface to our *Liturgy* acknowledges) Theſe and ſuch like things can't be excus'd from *ſuperſtition.*

Together with theſe I might add a number of obſervations which are neither proper to *Popery*, nor indeed to the *Chriſtian Religion*, but are ſcatter'd all over the World. Such as St. *Auſtin* means when he complains of *Millia inaniſſimarum obſervationum, &c.* and ſuch as *Aquinas* comprehends, when he makes divers kinds of *ſuperſtition, Divinationes & varia obſervationum genera.* Of which Cuſtoms *Mahometaniſm* and *Gentiliſm* are very full. But having given account of theſe before, I paſs them with this general acknowledgment.

Whatever we do upon a Religious account, where Religion, properly

perly ſo called, ought not to be concern'd; When any undue Opinion of God excites us to any action, when we exerciſe our ſelves in that, which may be deſervedly called, *Indebitus Dei Cultus*, when we think God is pleas'd with ſuch a manner of performance, which does not pleaſe him; as it does well agree with the Import of Δεισιδαιμονία (an *over-timorous* and *ſervile apprehenſion* of the *Deity*) ſo may it properly be called *ſuperſtition.*

But in as much as it is very evident, that the *ſuperſtitious* Opinions of the Church of *Rome* are rejected by the *Church of England*, in as much as it can't be prov'd, that any of our ſervice is enjoin'd upon any other Opinion equally *ſuperſtitious*; we conclude, there is wrong done us, when *ſuperſtition* is laid to our charge. Yea, if peradventure ſome of our Church ſhould have private Opini-

ons

ons of their own, that might render their particular practices *superstitious*, yet this is enough to deliver our service from the Imputation, and in this we persist as our just Vindication.

There is no *Canon* nor *Rubrick*, no *Article* nor *Injunction* that obliges any within our Communion to any *superstitious Opinion*.

4. *Proposition.* Sect. 22.

There are superstitious Omissions of which men may be guilty; and that then, when they seem to have a great zeal against superstition. It was laid to the N. C^ts^. charge in *King James* his time, that they were guilty of *negative superstition*. A phrase cavil'd at by those who reply upon Bishop *Morton*, but Dr *Burges* has sufficiently vindicated it, and commends them to their friend *Ames*, who comprehends it in his definition of *superstition*. For when he had defin'd it to be an excess

Burges *Answer Rejoin'd Preface, p.* 64.

Medul. Theolog. lib. 2. Cap. 13.

excess of Religion; He adds, *cujusmodi excessus non tantum est in exercitiis positivis, sed etiam in Abstinentiâ à quarundam rerum usu, ut àcibis.* *This excess of Religion is not only in what we positively do, but may be also, in what we abstain from, as Meats.*

True it is, that *superstition* is an excess, as it hath been defin'd, yet the defect in the practice may be *superstitious*, because it may proceed from excess in the Opinion. For if a *superstitious* Opinion be the reason why men abstain from the use of a Ceremony, that abstinence is as properly *superstitious*, as the use of it upon a *superstitious* Opinion can be. *My Lord Bacon* says well and wisely. *There is a superstition in avoiding superstition, when men think to do best, if they go fartheſt from the superstition formerly received.*

Bacon Essay of Superstition.

There is a *superstitious fearfulness* in some men, of which St. *Austin* complains thus. *Sensi sæpe dolens & gemens, multas*

August. Januario. Ep. 118.

multas infirmorum perturbationes fieri, per quorundam fratrum contentioſam obſtinationem & ſuperſtitioſam timiditatem, qui in rebus hujuſmodi, quæ neq; ſacræ ſcripturæ Authoritate neq; Univerſalis Eccleſiæ traditione neq; vitæ corrigendæ utilitate ad certum poſſunt terminum pervenire, tantum quia ſubeſt qualiſcunq; ratiocinatio, cogitantis aut quia in ſuâ patriâ ſic ipſe conſuevit, aut quia ibi vidit, ubi peregrinationem ſuam quò remotiorem à ſuis eò doctiorem factam putant, tam litigioſas excitant quæſtiones, ut niſi quod ipſi faciunt nihil rectum exiſtimant. Words which by a little alteration and paraphraſe are but too accommodate to the caſe of our preſent Diſſenters.

"To the grief of my Soul I have "often obſerv'd, how weak and ſcru- "pulous minds have been miſerably "perplex'd in matters of Religion, "by the contentious obſtinacy and "*ſuperſtitious fearfulneſs* of ſome who "ſeem to be very Godly men. Dif-

"ferences

" ferences arise in matters Indifferent
" and alterable in their own natures;
" such as the H. Scripture hath not
" any where particularly determin'd;
" nor hath any tradition of the Uni-
" versal Church fix'd them in one
" certain course; nor can it be said,
" that for the bettering the lives of
" men, it must be thus, and may
" not be so: yet there are Jealousies
" and scruples in their minds, it may
" be they remember it otherwise in
" their times, and where they have
" lived. It may be they have been
" as far as *Scotland*, *Amsterdam*, or *Ge-*
" *neva*, and have a greater opinion
" of what is done abroad: For one
" reason or other they are litigious
" and troublesome, and think no-
" thing well done, but what they do
" themselves.

From this scrupulosity are men apt to call any thing into question, and for fear lest they should err on one

one hand, and run into *superstition* and *Popery*; they run as far on the other; and their Omissions are as *superstitious*, as they fear'd their practice would have been.

Such was the case of the *Jews*, when they were assaulted by their Enemies on the *Sabbath day*; rather than violate the *Sabbath* by defending themselves, they tamely suffer'd themselves to be destroyed. The law of self-preservation could not perswade them to any resistance, and if *Mattathias* had not been wiser than the rest, they might all have perished. 1 Machab. 2.

Such also was the *superstition* of the Souldiers in *Sfetigrade*, when *Amurath* besieg'd it (*An.* 1449.) A Traytor in the City had cast *a dead dog*, into the only Well which supplyed the City with Water: which when it was espied in the Morning by the Souldiers, no Importunity could perswade Knol. *Turk. History.*

swade them to drink of that Water which they reputed *Unclean by a dogs Carcass*; so was the Governour compell'd to surrender the City.

And such surely was the conceit of that zealous man some while since among our selves, who cut out of his *Bible*, the *Contents of the Chapters*, and so would cut out the word of God it self, that was on the other side of the page, rather than suffer any *Humane mixture* with the pure word of God.

Whether the case of our N. C^ts. be not somewhat parallel, is now to be consider'd. They suspect *superstition* in the use of the *Surplice* and *Cross*, *&c.* and therefore Religiously abstain from them; but what if this Abstinence also should be *superstitious*? If the Rites and Ceremonies of our Church be as they imagine, it must be, either because we judge that *lawful* which is *Unlawful*, or that *necessary* which is but *Indifferent*, or because

becauſe theſe Ceremonies though granted in their own nature *Indifferent*, yet by reaſon of ſome Accident that attends them, may not be impos'd, and may not be ſubmitted to if impos'd. All which things have already had their Conſideration, after all which I have not doubted to conclude, that our Rites may be us'd without *ſuperſtition*.

But now I move a doubt on the other ſide, to which if they cannot give a better Anſwer than I am aware of, they can't excuſe themſelves from *ſuperſtition*. For what other reaſons Conformity may be refus'd I now enquire not. If any refuſe it, becauſe they cannot wear a *Surplice*, or uſe the *Croſs*, and if any private perſons neglect the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, becauſe they cannot *kneel* as is commanded; I deſire to know for what reaſons they are not free to join with us in theſe Uſages.

Either they think them law Unlawful: If lawful, ſuch as may be ſubmitted to, and yet for ſome politick reſpects they will not ſubmit; this Abſtinence of theirs may be free from *ſuperſtition*, but ſome other way it will be as Unaccountable: For he who without violating his Conſcience can conform but will not, let him (if he can) excuſe his diſobedience to the Powers which God hath ſet over him, let him (if he can) deliver himſelf from the Character of a contentious man.

If without fraud or guile, there be a man who does not act becauſe he dare not, who is perſwaded in his Conſcience, he ſhould ſin againſt God, and do that which is Unlawful, if he ſhould wear a *Surplice*, &c. This is the man whom I charge with *ſuperſtition*, becauſe he judges that *Unlawful*, which is *Indifferent*, becauſe he proceeds upon a miſtake of the

the nature of things, becauſe a falſe opinion betrays him to this abſtinence. He declares hereby that he hath a wrong Notion and apprehenſion of God, when he thinks him diſpleas'd by ſuch an Action, againſt which the Scripture hath not declar'd his diſpleaſure. As men may teach for Doctrines the poſitive Commands of men, ſo may they alſo teach for Doctrines the prohibitions of men; and this is *adding to the word of God*. And in this does *Ames* condition take place. *In illâ Abſtinentiâ Honor aliquis ſingularis Deo intenditur*. They conceit they Honour God by abſtaining from that which is no where forbidden. It is no where ſaid, neither in expreſs words, nor in any equivalent phraſe, That it is the will of God, no man ſhould wear a *white Garment* when he Miniſters in Divine Offices; that no man ſhould *kneel*

Medul. Theol. ut prius.

when he receives the Sacrament, &c. Wherefore what God hath cleanſed, why ſhould we call Common? Where is the man that hath Authority to pronounce that Unclean, which God hath not ſo pronounc'd? The neceſſary uſe of theſe things when they are commanded, does not take away the *Indifferency* of their nature, and this delivers us from *ſuperſtition*: But to abſtain from them as *Unlawful* in their nature, does directly contradict the opinion of their *Indifferency*, and leaves the men who ſo abſtain, under the guilt and bond of *ſuperſtition*.

So may men find that at a Conventicle, which they are afraid to meet at Church. *Superſtition* lodges in the minds of men, and they who are inclin'd to it, may diſcover it when they ſit ſtill, as well as when they move. *Touch not*, *taſt not*, *handle not*, are not greater Indications of a

ſuper-

superstitious abstinence, than are *wear not*, *kneel not*, *Cross not*; when the Doctrine of these Ceremonies is known to be Innocent and allowable. Wherefore they who are indeed afraid of *superstition*, who are afraid of mixing their own Inventions with the worship of God, and doing that which is not requir'd at their hands, are concern'd rightly to inform themselves, in what they are commanded to do: And when they find that the H. Scripture hath no where forbid the use of the *Surplice* upon those Terms upon which it is enjoin'd, (only the liberty which they themselves had power to determine, is by the Magistrate determin'd for them, not lightly or wantonly, but for grave and weighty reasons) Let them not fear they shall *transgress* where there is *no law*. Let them not fear *superstition* in those practices to which they are induc'd by

Opinions not *ſuperſtitious*. But on the other ſide let the fear be, leſt they make the way to Heaven ſtraiter than our Saviour hath made it. Leſt they ſcruple and condemn that which does not appear unlawful. Leſt they ſplit upon *Scylla* while they ſhun *Charybdis*. Leſt they run into *ſuperſtition* while they deſired to avoid it, and leſt an Innocent Ceremony ſcare them to an Unjuſtifyable Separation.

FINIS.

A

PEACEABLE

PLEA

FOR

UNION and *PEACE*,

In an Expoſtulatory Addreſs both to the Conformiſt and Non-Conformiſt.

BEING AN

APPENDIX

TO A LATE

DISCOURSE

OF

Superſtition, &c.

By *W. S.*

There will come a time, when Three words uttered with Charity and Meekneſs, ſhall receive a far more bleſſed reward, than three thouſand Volumes written with diſdainful ſharpneſs of wit. Hooker, Preface to Eccleſiaſtical Polity.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. M.* for *J. Robinſon* at the *Golden Lyon* in St *Paul*'s *Church-Yard*, 1681.

A PEACEABLE PLEA FOR Union and Peace, &c.

THERE was not long ſince, publiſhed a ſmall Tract, intituled, *A Diſcourſe of Superſtition*, the deſign of which was, to vindicate the *Church* of *England* from that imputation, and to repreſent the inoffenſiveneſs of her Rites and Ceremonies; ſo as no ſuſpicion of her being Popiſhly

affected, may reaſonably ariſe from her preſent Eſtabliſhments. This was manag'd with reſpect to the Times as they then were, when yet the heats between the Conformiſt and the Non-conformiſt, (who both pretend to an equal Zeal againſt Popery) were great enough, and a Reconciliation doubtful.

The ſcene is ſince alter'd. We both have been awaken'd and alarm'd by our common Enemy, and it has been generally believed, that no denomination of Proteſtants has reaſon to expect indempnity, or may preſume of ſafety upon the prevalence of the Romiſh intereſt. And who would not have thought, that an appearance of ſo great danger would have united the minds of men, would have cool'd their heats and ſoftned their ſpirits, and have molded us to a mutual agreement, and a better under-

understanding of the common interests of the Reformed Religion?

But alas! Our common Dangers have not begot in us a common sense. We do not hasten to a closure and accommodation: A great part of men retain the same eagerness (not to say virulence) of spirit, as if they had rather perish asunder, than be saved together. As if they inherited the enmity of *Eteocles* and *Polynices*, and resolv'd that their very flames should not mix if Persecution should overtake them. Recriminations are bandied to and fro. The *Conformist* is Popishly affected and advances towards *Rome*, is a *Socinian* and a *Pelagian*, and any thing that is naught. The *Non-conformist* is a *Rebel* and a *Traytor*, ungovernable and unfit for humane society. From the rashness of some particular

men, or from well-meant words unhappily diſtorted, a whole party is concluded, and fierce men repreſent their Adverſaries with all imaginable diſadvantage.

And what will now heal us? Will diſputing put us in joint again? Will writing one againſt another compoſe and ſettle the minds of men? Let men uſe their own diſcretion. I blame not thoſe who vindicate themſelves, and argue for the ſatisfaction of others, if in a ſpirit of meekneſs they ſeek to reſtore their Brother, whom they conceive overtaken in an errour. But for my own part, when I obſerve how hardly any thing can be ſo well and firmly ſaid, but preſently an Anſwer is prepar'd againſt it; how few men are alter'd in their opinions, or ſweetned in their tempers, by what comes from an adverſe party; I much fear the

diſ-

diſputacity of theſe Times is not the moſt likely means to put an end to our preſent controverſies. Yea I do with ſome difficulty ſatisfy my ſelf, that this well-intended ſcript (how far ſoever it is removed from all ſowrneſs and frowardneſs) is fit to be expoſed. And were it not in great meaſure extorted by the importunity of a Friend, who having got a ſight of theſe few lines, was earneſt to have them Printed, it ſhould longer be conſidered (though the ſubſtance of it has for ſome good while lain by me) whether probability of ſucceſs will warrant its being made publick.

Sure I am, I mean well to the Peace and Union of all good men, and to the proſperity of this Church. Sure I am, I have no deſign to embitter any mans ſpirit, or make him more angry than he is already. I will

not diſpute the Caſe of Conformity. I muſt be thought to believe it lawful, (for if I did not think ſo, I would not practiſe it.) Our Worſhip as it is eſtabliſhed by law, is (I think) free from Superſtition. Our Doctrine as expreſſed in our Articles, is not (ſo far as I can diſcern) Popiſh, nor ſuch to which an honeſt man may not with a good Conſcience ſubſcribe: But inſtead of arguing and diſputing any farther, and ſo perhaps exaſperating and making the breach wider; I will exhort and beſeech in all ſincerity and plainneſs, but as free from paſſion and bitterneſs as I am able to attemper my ſtile.

And firſt, To you my Reverend Brethren of the Conformable Clergy (for I aſſume not the boldneſs to teach my Governours and ſuperiours) I will with your good leave thus addreſs my ſelf: If any thing may

may be done on our parts to reduce Diſſenters to our Communion, with a great zeal to Peace and Unity let it be done.

When we charge them for ſeparating from us, we declare, That we think they would do wiſer and better if they would return and incorporate with us. Conſider we then with our ſelves: Are there any prudent arts that may influence upon the gaining of them? There muſt be a great difference put between our complying with them, and that complyance to which we would perſwade them. We boaſt not of our priviledge, as being under the protection of the laws, and thereby expecting (without making any ſteps of accommodation towards them) that others ſhould come over to us. But we plead, That becauſe of our obligation to the Laws, we can-

cannot to the neglect of our duty comply with Diſſenters. Wherefore what uſes to be ſaid in matters of liberty and private right, *viz.* That both parties muſt yield ſomewhat to each other, in order to an happy cloſure and a laſting peace; this muſt by no means be urged in this caſe. If the N. C^ſts can ſatisfy their Conſciences to come over to us, in obedience to the Law, they will do well. (If they can't, I urge them not to go againſt their Conſciences as will again appear.) But we who have declared our belief of the lawfulneſs of Conformity, and who have undertaken the practice of it, can't fall off to them, unleſs we change our opinion, and acknowledge our miſtake in the principles upon which we have hitherto practiſed. I ſhall then be peeviſhly, and not without ſome ill deſign upon my good intentions, miſ-

misrepresented, if any thing I am now saying, be thus construed; that we may juggle or falter in matters of Conformity, that we may balk our duty, and be false to the obligations we have brought upon our selves, that *thus becoming all things to all men we may gain some.* For, besides that this is no probable course to beget in any that dissent from us, a greater veneration of us, or our party and way; so will it be doing evil that good may come of it, and will lay a greater stumbling block than it will remove.

But when I speak of yielding and complying as far as we can, in order to the reduction of those of the separation; I mean, whatever may be done by the regularness of our conversations, by the prudence of our correspondencies, by the obligingness of our behaviour,

haviour, by our great care that we do not tempt any diſaffected men, to entertain any prejudices againſt our Conformity for our perſon's ſake, as we ſtudy Union and as we love Peace all this become us. Stand we our ground, be we true to our undertakings and practice as we have promiſed; where we are bound up by a Law, as we are honeſt and conſcientious men we muſt obey. But throughout the courſe of our lives, if we can reaſonably think that any thing we ſay or do, will probably more alienate thoſe who are already prejudic'd from joyning with us, with all the circumſpection and warineſs imaginable take we heed to our ſelves; ſo let us live, that we may all with a good Conſcience ſay, It is not my fault that there are ſo many Non-conformiſts.

By what I now ſay, I do not accuſe

accuſe my Brethren, but it is notoriouſly known many do; and though there are many calumnies and ſlanders faſten'd upon the Conformable Clergy, in deſign to diſgrace Conformity it ſelf; yet I thought it would look like partiality to give all the caution on the other ſide. Therefore with you my Brethren I have taken ſome liberty, and they who are friends to peace will take it well. Many of you have written worthily, and with great learning in defence of the Church of *England*, but with no great ſucceſs, as to the reduction of thoſe of another perſwaſion. Shall we try if ſweetneſs of temper, if integrity of life, if the unblameableneſs of our manners may have a better effect? Surely the *wrath of man worketh not the Righteouſneſs of God.* We may not think to revile or rail them into that Conformity into

into which they have not yet been argued. At the worſt, whatever ſome of them may deſerve to hear; we muſt conſider what is fit for us to ſpeak. Our deportment toward them, may not be with ſuch condeſcenſions as may ſignifie any diſtruſt of our cauſe, then ſhall we by the uſe of the means, diſable our ſelves from obtaining our end, and no methods of prudence will ſo direct us. But if it would be happy for us, as *Brethren to dwell together in unity*; If the diviſions that are among us, weaken and expoſe us to the deſigns of thoſe who would ruin us both; then is it pious and Religious, then is it ſafe and prudent, worthy of men, of Chriſtians, of Proteſtants, of peaceable Sons of a peaceable Church, to do all that in us lies to gain our Brethren, at leaſt to take thus much care of our ſelves, that no in-

diſcretions

diſcretions on our part encreaſe the number of Non-conformiſts.

And now Secondly, I apply my ſelf to you who differ from us.

At your hands, Beloved in our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, (for in him the love we bear to all that would but ſeem to be born of him, it is not the ſea of your gall and bitterneſs that ſhall ever drown) I have no great Cauſe to look for other, than the ſelf ſame portion and lot, which your manner has been hitherto to lay on them that concur not in opinion and ſentence with you. Theſe are almoſt the firſt words of Mr. *Hookers* Preface to his *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*; which I therefore uſe, not becauſe I would prejudge and at firſt conclude you full of gall and bitterneſs, but becauſe I would fain expreſs alike candor and meekneſs towards you. Believe it as you ſee cauſe, yet give me leave to ſay, I have an unfeigned value for the perſons of many of you.

It

It is not (I thank God) the arrogance of my mind that tempts me to think I can perſwade better than others, but in the midſt of our warm debates, and arguings, and diſputings, my hearty zeal to the proſperity of the *Church* of *England* inclines me to imagine that ſomewhat elſe ſtill remains to be done towards a firm and happy Union. Wherefore Men and Brethren ſuffer me to vent my thoughts, and when I have ſpoken ſay your pleaſures.

And I will begin boldly with you.

1. Firſt, If any of you can with a good Conſcience Conform, for Gods ſake, for the Churches ſake, for Peace ſake ſhew your ſelves men of Conſcience; and if *it be poſſible as much as lyes in you, live peaceably with all men*, and yield obedience to your lawful Governours.

Laugh

Laugh not at this supposition. I judge you not. But you cannot be ignorant, that many thus think of divers of you. Many of your party have bred your Sons to that Conformity which your selves refuse. A practice which has sometimes been thus interpreted. *Not a few of those Ministers which refused Conformity in their own persons, do quietly suffer it in their own Sons: which is Argument sufficient to prove, that they do not think so ill of these Ceremonies as their Books speak, seeing they love the Salvation of their own Children as they ought.* By some other approaches that many of you have sometimes made to the Lay part of Conformity, it has been imagined that if Policy and Humane considerations did not keep you at a distance, you could come nearer to us. God knows your hearts, not I. I censure none of you as Hypocrites in this mat-

Burges Rejoynder. p. 4.

ter, yet give me leave to make the ſuppoſition. Separate not from us, if you can Conform. We will not inquire into the reaſons of your former averſneſs. It will be a glorious piece of ſelf-denyal to recede from your former miſtakes. Your reputation cannot be ſo much hazarded by changing your practice, as your Conſcience muſt be diſſatisfied by ſtanding out in oppoſition to thoſe Laws, to which yet you can yield obedience. If any of you, between God and your own ſouls believe it lawful; anſwer it if you can to your own thoughts; Why do you break the Laws, and forſake the Church, and maintain a Separation, if with a good Conſcience you could come over to us?

2. If in truth you are not ſatisfied (as in the judgment of Charity it ſeems) if there be any thing in our Communion becauſe of which you

you decline coming up cloſe to us: yet as you are Chriſtian men, and hope to be ſaved by the Goſpel of peace, ſuffer me to be thus far earneſt with you. Though you cannot go ſo far as we, in obedience to Eccleſiaſtical Laws, yet out of Religion to God, out of Loyalty to your Prince (whoſe Grace and favour you have often and long felt) as you love Peace and would approve your ſelves conſcientious Men, ſeparate no farther from us than you needs muſt. *Let every ſoul of you be ſubject to the higher powers*, as far as you can with a good and a ſafe Conſcience. And now my Brethren, I beſeech you ſay: Can you not come to Church? Can you not joyn with our Publick Prayers, and can you not hear us Preach? If there be ſome few of you, that think our Prayers ſuperſtitious, yet

this is manifeſt, there are great Numbers of you (both Preachers and Hearers) that have often joyned with us: And why can you not do ſo ſtill? Is *neceſſity laid upon you*? Will *woe be to you*? Do you verily think you ſhould diſpleaſe God, if you ſhould Preach before we begin, or after we have done? What if it be a little inconvenient? Would you not have it believed, that you have run many Hazards and ſubmitted to many inconveniences to keep a good Conſcience; and why may not this be added to the number? Muſt you needs altogether withdraw the people of our Pariſhes from us? There was more modeſty among you ſince 1662. and ſome of you cannot yet be perſwaded to keep up your private Meetings at the ſame hours when the reſt of the Pariſh are at Church. I offer it to your Conſcience

ſcience as you are men of peace, and profeſs a deſire to comply with the Laws as far as you can, that you would conſider of this matter. Delight not in going as far as is poſſible from us. If it be not unlawful to come to Church, I beſeech you conſider whether it be not unlawful to ſtay away.

3. If it muſt be thus, let me ſolicit you with another queſtion; whatever obligations you that were in employment at or before 1662. may pretend, that *having put your hand to the plough, you cannot look back*; yet can you think it excuſable to train up a number of young men, and to prepare them to ſucceed you, and act your part when you ſhall go off the ſtage? Was it not enough that you have been conniv'd at (whatever ſome of you talk of perſecution) and that the Laws have been much remitted to-

wards your own perſons, but you muſt take care to propagate the ſeparation to the next generation? What! is there neceſſity laid upon you for this too? You have ſpoken much of your numbers that have been laid aſide, but how many of them are dead within this eighteen years laſt paſt, and yet you uphold your party, and breed up a race of future Male-contents, that might as honeſtly and creditably have diverted to other employments. Yea when any of you dye, the ſurvivors are as buſie in chuſing a ſucceſſor to his Congregation, as if you thought it a great piece of Religion to keep people from returning to our Church. I muſt confeſs I cannot ſee how theſe are the ways of Peace. If the *Church* of *England* be a true Church, if the way of Salvation be plainly taught in our Pulpits (pardon me if I do

not

not ſet as high a value upon our Preaching, as ſome of you deſpiſe it) it is beyond my ſhallow capacity to know how to pronounce a Bleſſing upon you, under the notion of *peace-makers*.

4. You would fain preſerve the reputation of godly and conſcientious men. You Preach not for covetouſneſs or filthy lucre's ſake. If temporal reſpects had ſway'd moſt with you, you would not have loſt your Livings. You Preach principally out of Charity to the ſouls of men, and the Salvation of many thouſand ſouls are concern'd in the continuance of your ſeparated Meetings. Well! I upbraid you not. I hope you mean well. Yet with the ſame modeſty and meekneſs, I ask again, Why do you chuſe to crowd into the City and great Towns? at leaſt why do you not out of your publick banks (for

ſuch it is believed you have) provide for thoſe corners of the Country, ſome whereof are far from Church, and many have leſs aſſiduous preaching than is in the City. I preſs not theſe things ſo far, nor with that acrimony, as peradventure ſome would. But I take leave to add a conſideration or two more.

5. Make no objections againſt Conformity, but ſuch as really diſſatisfie you againſt it. Multiply not ſcruples for pomp or number. Make as candid and favourable interpretations of things, as you deſire ſhould be made to you, if your way were eſtabliſhed. Talk not of a Divine Warrant or Command, for every circumſtance of worſhip, when you know, that the *Directory* will as little bear ſuch arguing as the *Liturgy*. When *Presbyterians* and *Independents* both muſt

have recourſe to general Rules of Scripture, as well as *Epiſcopal* men. If you cannot bear with things, becauſe in your conceit they might be better order'd, there will never be a way of worſhip ſo compleat and pure, but ſome ſcrupulous minds will ſeparate from it, under pretence of greater purity. Why cannot you as well uſe the old Tranſlations as the Singing Pſalms? Why can you not declare your Aſſent and Conſent to uſe that Form of Service, which you could uſe if you were not to Aſſent to it? Whatever is tolerable in your own opinion, bear with it for peace ſake. If you think you could compile a better Liturgy, or order the worſhip of God to more edification (which if ever you ſhould have leave to do, you muſt expect that all men will not be of your mind, but exceptions and diſſatisfactions

will

will ariſe againſt you) yet remember you are not Governours, you are not to give laws in this thing, but to take and ſubmit to them. Wherefore out of reverence to your Governours, take things in the beſt ſenſe. We urge you not, to ſtrain your Conſciences to do that which you are fully perſwaded is a Sin. (That is a calumny which ſome of you would unjuſtly faſten upon us, as if we were Patrons of blind obedience and implicit Faith, and taught men to go againſt their Conſcience.) But yet neither do you pretend Conſcience where Conſcience is not in the caſe. Deal fairly and *bonâ fide* in all that you urge as cauſes of your ſeparation, and thoſe ſcruples which you can indeed conquer, lay them aſide and diſturb not the peace of the Church with them.

6. Let me ſay one thing more

to

to you. You are greatly miſtaken, if you think it adds any real advantage to your cauſe, to expoſe our perſons ſo liberally as ſome of you do. For what good Argument is this againſt your Conformity, becauſe the Incumbent of the next Pariſh is not ſo good a man as he ſhould be? Nay, rather is there more need that ſuch good men as you deſire to be reputed, ſhould get into employment, that the Nation may not be overrun with bad principles and licentious practices. There is little got by recriminating. You have heard how the excellent Prince *Charles* the *Firſt*, would not allow ſuch a kind of Anſwer to the *Century-writer*. If we were really as bad as ſome of your party would repreſent us, yet ſtill theſe are but the faults of particular men: no ſufficient blemiſhes to the Eſtabliſhments of our Church, nor ſufficient

ficient reaſons to encourage you in your ſeparation. I ſtudy to avoid diſputing, and therefore I take not upon me to prove, that we are not *Popiſhly affected*, nor *Socinians*; which yet I think I could prove. I think alſo your candor (upon conſidering our Articles and Liturgy) may induce you to have a better opinion of all the Clergy-men in *England*, whom you can think honeſt and conſcientious, and true to the Subſcriptions they have made, and the Prayers they uſe. As to failures in our manners, tho' I am willing to hope they are not ſo great or many, as the exaggerations of envious men would inſinuate, yet I wiſh they were fewer. I inſiſt not on this plea, that if you were without ſin, you might better throw ſtones at us. Yet this I ſay, Nothing of this nature can be a ſufficient cauſe of your ſeparation.

But

But I ask you no more queſtions, nor will I be farther troubleſome to you. What remains ſhall be in common directed to both parties.

We have on both ſides diſputed, and preached, and printed, and bewail'd Diviſions, and pleaded for Peace, and acknowledged how deſirable Union is: And ſtill *we have looked for Peace but no good comes.* We are not yet of *one heart and one ſoul.* Nor is there any great appearance of our being of one way. Come now: Let us pray for one another. We all pretend to Chriſtianity. We call Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, and by the merits of the ſame Saviour we hope for that one common Salvation which he has purchaſed; and to enjoy it together in the ſame Heavens. And if it ſhould pleaſe God to ſuffer a foreign Religion to prevail upon

us,

us, no great doubt but we ſhould be all *Gibellins* and in the ſame common danger. Shall we love and pray one for another. Let us believe that Church diviſions are very deplorable, and if that be any motive to our Prayers, I will offer it in the words of Mr. *Baxter*.

Chriſtian Concord. *ad finem.*

If the Scriptures *were conſcionably obſerved, men would take* Church diviſion *for a greater ſin than* Adultery *or* Theft. Mutiniers *and* Diviſions *do more infallibly deſtroy an Army, than almoſt any other fault or weakneſs. And therefore all Generals puniſh* Mutineers *with death, as well as flat* Traytors. *I confeſs ten or twelve years ago, I wondred oft to find both Scripture and almoſt all the Voluminous writings of the Fathers, in every age to be filled with Exclamations againſt* Church dividers. *But now I know a little better the reaſon of it, and how prone even godly zealous Men (eſpecially young*

young unexperienced Christians) are to it, and of what desperate consequence it is. Our union is our strength and beauty. Commonly they that divide *for the bringing in any inferior truth or practice, do but destroy that Truth and Piety that was there before. I like not him that will cure the Head-ach by cutting the throat. No Master, no Law, no profession was ever more merciful, gentle, meek, more for unity, love and concord, than the Master, law and profession of Christians. Oh that the Lord would speedily arise and stir up in all his people in the world, so mighty a zeal for Unity and sanctity, that those Blessed Twins might conjunctly flourish, which thrive so ill when they are divided. And that the true Saints of Christ may once taste that sweetness, which such a blessed state of the Church would afford. However the friends of Peace and holiness shall taste of it.*

True it is, *if we regard iniquity in*

our

our hearts God will not hear our Prayers. If we pray for Peace, and harbour within our own ſouls revenge and ſpite, and ill will: If a ſpirit of contradiction rule in us at the ſame time, when we bewail the Diviſions of the times: If we do not *all that is poſſible, as much as lyes in us*, towards living peaceably, our Prayers will be very idle and ineffectual. But when we have well conſider'd the ſtate of this Church and Nation, when we are throughly reſolved to uſe our utmoſt diligence; then pray we to the God that *makes men to be of one mind in an houſe*, pray we to the *Author of peace and lover of concord* that he would teach us how we may *keep the Unity of the ſpirit in the bond of peace.*

And Oh that we could live to ſee the time *when* as *Brethren we might dwell together in Unity!* Oh that

that it were not too much, to hope for ſo much of heaven in this world! How ſhould I rejoyce to diſcern the firſt dawnings of ſo happy a day! Welcome, gladly welcome would be the leaſt appearance of Peace, the very firſt approaches towards Unity. I read indeed that *Abraham againſt hope believed in hope*, but he had the aſſurance of a particular promiſe to make him *ſtrong in the Faith*. But I ſhould flatter my ſelf and dream, if I ſhould promiſe much in this thing. Men abound too much in their one ſenſe, men divide themſelves from the whole, and conſider what would ſingly gratifie themſelves, not what would be beſt for the whole body.

Wherefore, though I am willing (as I have uſed ſome of the firſt words of Mr. *Hooker*'s Preface, ſo) to conclude with the laſt words of the ſame Preface; yet I am hear-

tily ſorry that I cannot uſe them as my own words. That good Man had a Charity as vaſt as his Learning, and was willing to hope the beſt. But length of time which ſpends ſome humors, has made our diſtempers rather the more incurable. Yet I will uſe his words, that I may put good men and lovers of Peace, in mind to pray, that the time may once come when we may ſay as he:

Our truſt in the Almighty is, that with us Contentions are now at the higheſt flote, and that the day will come (for what cauſe of deſpair is there) when the paſſions of former enmity being allay'd, we ſhall with ten times redoubled tokens of our unfeigned reconciled love, ſhew our ſelves each towards other the ſame, which Joſeph *and the Brethren of* Joſeph *were at the time of their enterview in* Egypt. *Our comfortable expectation and moſt thirſty deſire whereof, what man ſoever among you ſhall any way help to ſatisfie, (as we truly hope, there is no one amongſt you but ſome way or other will) the Bleſſings of the God of Peace, both in this world and in the world to come, be upon him, more than the Stars of the Firmament in number.*

FINIS.